

Shri K. M. Munshi Diamond Jubilee Volume—Part I

BHĀRATĪYA VIDYĀ
Volume IX
1948

EDITED BY

ACHARYA JINAVIJAYAJI MUNI

DR R C MAJUMDAR

DR A D PUSALKER

PROF JAYANTAKRISHNA H DAVE

PRINCIPAL V N BHUSHAN

PROF RAMNARAIN V PATHAK

PROF H C. BHAYANI



BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN
BOMBAY

Published in August 1949

Price Rupees Fifteen

Printed by G. B. Sardesai, M.A., LL.B., Navin Samarth Vidyalaya
Samarth Bhawan Press 41 Bodhiwar Path, Poona 2.
AND

Published by R. H. Ramani for Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan,
Chowpatty Road, Bombay 7

FOREWORD

The Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan conceived the idea of presenting Shri Munshi a volume of essays on various aspects of Indian history and culture and allied subjects of study written by distinguished scholars all over India in celebration of his having completed 60 years. An editorial committee consisting of Acharya Jinavijayaji, Dr R C Majumdar, Dr. A D. Pusalker, Prof Jayantakrishna H Dave, Prin. V N Bhushan, Prof Ramnarain V Pathak and Prof H C Bhayani was appointed with this object in view. They issued an appeal and received about sixty papers. It was decided to publish this Diamond Jubilee Commemoration Volume in two parts, the first of which the Committee have now the great pleasure to offer to the public.

The response to the Committee's appeal has been both generous and representative. This will be evident from the number and variety of papers included in this volume. It will be invidious to single out particular names, but the Committee are proud to feel that the contributors include a large number of scholars whose name and fame have spread far beyond the boundaries of India. The articles also cover a wide variety of subjects dealing with history, politics, philosophy, religion, art, science and literature. This is a fitting tribute to one whose versatile talents and achievements in various fields of activity such as law, politics, diplomacy, literature, education and social service have earned for him a unique place in India of to-day. The Committee take this opportunity of conveying their heartfelt thanks to the band of scholars who have contributed to make this volume a rich and suitable offering to a great genius and a distinguished Indian.

Little need be said here on the life and activities of Shri K. M. Munshi. They are too well known all over India and have been discussed from different points of view in a volume entitled "Munshi—His Art and Work" published on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee of Shri K. M. Munshi. But such

is the dynamic personality of Shri Munshi that he has won laurels in fresh fields even during the short period of two years that have passed since its publication. The far-sighted statesmanship which he displayed as the Agent General of the Government of India to Hyderabad is still fresh in our memory and when the true history of this premier state of India in its last phase comes to light the world will perhaps learn with agreeable surprise the extent to which Shri Munshi contributed to the final happy solution of this acute and perplexing problem by his tact judgment and personality

Shri Munshi is still full of life and vitality and it would not be too much to hope that the writer of the Foreword to the Second Part of this volume will have again something new to add to his brilliant achievements. With this hope and prayer I beg to offer to Shri Munshi this humble offering of his countrymen in token of respect and admiration and of gratefulness for his splendid services to the cause of our common motherland.

March 15 1949

R. C. MAJUMDAR

The Diamond Jubilee of Shri K. M. Munshi was the most happy event for the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, and the Bhavan decided that one of the ways to celebrate the memorable occasion was to present a volume of Indological Studies to our President. The Editorial Board accordingly sent Circular Letters inviting contributions to various scholars. The response was very encouraging. The Editorial Board, however, regrets the delay in publication owing to unavoidable circumstances. It is indeed an unfortunate contrast to the readiness and promptitude with which the learned contributors responded to our request. It has now been decided to publish the volume in two parts, and we have great pleasure in issuing the first part.

The volume comprises of about 60 articles contributed by learned scholars each of whom has written on the subject of his special study. These articles cover a wide range of subjects in the field of Indology, and are bound to make the volume a very useful publication with its appeal to a variety of intellectual interests and aptitudes. We tender our grateful thanks to all contributors. Particular mention must be made of scholars outside India, viz Drs Carpani, Dumont, Eliade, Pisani, Renou, and Ruben, who sent their papers at a short notice.

It is a matter of deep regret to us that two of our valued contributors, Dr A. K. Coomaraswamy and Dr B. M. Barua, passed away while the volume was in print. Both were scholars of international reputation and authorities in their respective fields. Dr Coomaraswamy was the greatest interpreter and historian of Indian Art, and Dr Barua was the doyen of Pali and Buddhistic scholars. Their death has been a serious loss to Indian scholarship.

Munshi's life and life-work, his universal interests, his services to the cause of Aryan Culture, Bhagavadgītā and Sanskrit Learning, his various social, educational, literary and political activities, and above all, his unique role in the creation of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan and in bringing it to its present standard, are too well known to be dealt with here.

Prof. Munshi's excursions in the domain of Ideology are not as widely known as his achievements in other fields and hence for the information of the general reader it is thought necessary to refer in brief to his important and valuable contributions to Oriental and historical research.

In "Gujarāṭa and Its Literature" a standard and authoritative work dealing critically and comprehensively with the Literature of Gujarat during the last twelve hundred years Munshi has for the first time fixed the chronological position of Narasimha Mehta who was till then placed in c. 1450 A.C. and supposed to have flourished before Caitanya. Munshi has shown that the Bhakti of Narasimha bears traces of the Vṛndāvana School, and he could not have preceded Caitanya.

"Early Aryans in Gujarāṭa" which formed the subject of the Thakker Vasanji Madhavji Lectures under the auspices of the University of Bombay contains Munshi's views about the comparative value of the Vedic Texts and the Purāṇas the early Vedic tribes, the career of Parāśurāma the Bhṛgu-Haiḥaya conflict and the historicity of the Bhārata War. He has shown that the Śāryātas and the Bhṛgus were the earliest Aryan colonisers of Gujarāṭa and Śāryāta was the first Aryan connected with it. Māhātma of the Kārtavīryas generally identified with Onkar Mandhata Mandala or Mahāeshwar has been located on the basis of sound reasons, somewhere near Broach. Munshi has also attempted to show that the story of the Mahābhārata is historically unreliable and is based on the traditions grown up round the Dīkṣarāja and the great conflicts of Parāśurāma. In support he has also adduced the evidence of the conspiracy of silence of the Vedic Texts about the Bhārata War and the heroes participating therein.

Munshi pursued the same subject in its wider application in "The Aryans: Pre-Vedic and Vedic" which forms the major part of the first volume of the "Glory that was Gujarāṭa". This section surveys the home and the international contacts of the early Aryans during pre-Vedic period. Munshi proves on a variety of grounds that Saptaśindhu is the original home of the Aryans. He finds three main layers viz. pre

Varuṇa, Varuṇa, and Indra, in the pre-Vedic and Vedic Aryans Munshi's conclusions show that the Atharvan Aryans were the earliest in the field, and may be connected with the Indus Valley Civilisation. They evolved the same tradition in Persia and India, which was later replaced by Varuna worship. Panis were connected with Atharvan Aryans. Vedic Aryans, either directly or through Atharvan Aryans of the West Coast, were in contact with the Sumerians, who were Indian in type and whose records disclose many features similar to those in Atharvan tradition.

The problem of the early Aryan settlers in Gujarat has been further developed in the "Linguistic Provinces and the Future of Bombay" where Munshi shows that the Kankanas and Bhṛgukacchas who inhabited Gujārāta were the first to introduce Aryan language in the West Coast. It is further shown that the Konkani is derived from an ancestor of Śaurasenī Prakrit.

"Imperial Gūrjaras" which deals exhaustively with the history of Gūrjaradeśa in all aspects from 500 to 1300 A.C. may be considered as the *magnum opus* of Munshi. The varying boundaries of Gūrjaradeśa have been studied chronologically. The panorama of the successive rulers of Gūrjaradeśa, the Pratihāras, the Paramāras, and the Cālukyas, is vividly portrayed. Munshi has taken into account all earlier writers in the field. As the result of piecing together all inscriptions and Jain literary works on the subject, he has proved that the Agnikula and the foreign origin theory in connection with the Gūrjaras is untenable. Munshi has established that the Pratihāras, Cāhamānas, Cālukyas and Paramāras were allied clans belonging to Hindu society from the first time they appear in history. The Gūrjara-Pratihāras of Kanauj have been shown to have come from the region of Mt. Abu, and to have ruled Northern India (including parts of modern Gujarat) for over 250 years. The most important and original contribution of Munshi on the subject is the identification of Bhūyada or Bhūyadeva of Kalyānakataka with the Pratihāra Mihira Bhoja (also known as Bhoja, or Bhūbhṛt, or Ādivarāha) of Kanauj, and the reconstruction of his glorious reign.

The real nature of the so-called invasions of Mahmud has

Dr. M. D. Desai's excursions in the domain of Indology are not as widely known as his achievements in other fields and hence for the information of the general reader it is thought necessary to refer in brief to his important and valuable contributions to Oriental and historical research.

In "Gujarāṭa and Its Literature" a standard and authoritative work dealing critically and comprehensively with the Literature of Gujarat during the last twelve hundred years Munshi has for the first time fixed the chronological position of Narasimha Mehta who was till then placed in c. 1450 A. C. and supposed to have flourished before Caitanya. Munshi has shown that the Bhakti of Narasimha bears traces of the Vṛndāvana School, and he could not have preceded Caitanya.

"Early Aryans in Gujarāṭa" which formed the subject of the Thakkar Vasanji Madhavji Lectures under the auspices of the University of Bombay contains Munshi's views about the comparative value of the Vedic Texts and the Purāṇas the early Vedic tribes the career of Paraśurāma the Bhṛgu-Haiḥaya conflict and the historicity of the Bhārata War. He has shown that the Śāryātas and the Bhṛguas were the earliest Aryan colonisers of Gujarāṭa and Śāryāti was the first Aryan connected with it. Mahāmatī of the Kārtavīryas generally identified with Onkar Mandhata Mandala or Maheshwar has been located on the basis of sound reasons, somewhere near Broach. Munshi has also attempted to show that the story of the Mahābhārata is historically unreliable and is based on the traditions grown up round the Dīśarājha and the great conflict of Paraśurāma. In support he has also adduced the evidence of the conspiracy of silence of the Vedic Texts about the Bhārata War and the heroes participating therein.

Munshi pursued the same subject in its wider application in "The Aryans: Pre Vedic and Vedic" which forms the major part of the first volume of the "Glory that was Gūrjara deśa". This section surveys the home and the international contacts of the early Aryan during pre-Vedic period. Munshi proves on a variety of grounds that Saptasindhu is the original home of the Aryas. He finds three main layers viz. pre

Varuṇa, Varuna, and Indra, in the pre-Vedic and Vedic Aryans. Munshi's conclusions show that the Atharvan Aryans were the earliest in the field, and may be connected with the Indus Valley Civilisation. They evolved the same tradition in Persia and India, which was later replaced by Varuna worship. Pāṇis were connected with Atharvan Aryans. Vedic Aryans, either directly or through Atharvan Aryans of the West Coast, were in contact with the Sumerians, who were Indian in type and whose records disclose many features similar to those in Atharvan tradition.

The problem of the early Aryan settlers in Gujarat has been further developed in the "Linguistic Provinces and the Future of Bombay" where Munshi shows that the Kankanas and Bhṛgukacchas who inhabited Gujārāta were the first to introduce Aryan language in the West Coast. It is further shown that the Konkani is derived from an ancestor of Śauraseni Prākrit.

"Imperial Gūrjaras" which deals exhaustively with the history of Gūrjaradeśa in all aspects from 500 to 1300 A. C. may be considered as the *magnum opus* of Munshi. The varying boundaries of Gūrjaradeśa have been studied chronologically. The panorama of the successive rulers of Gūrjaradeśa, the Pratihāras, the Paramāras, and the Cāluhyas, is vividly portrayed. Munshi has taken into account all earlier writers in the field. As the result of piecing together all inscriptions and Jain literary works on the subject, he has proved that the Agnikula and the foreign origin theory in connection with the Gūrjaras is untenable. Munshi has established that the Pratihāras, Cāhamānas, Cāluhyas and Paramāras were allied clans belonging to Hindu society from the first time they appear in history. The Gūrjara-Pratihāras of Kanauj have been shown to have come from the region of Mt. Abu, and to have ruled Northern India (including parts of modern Gujarat) for over 250 years. The most important and original contribution of Munshi on the subject is the identification of Bhūyada or Bhūyadeva of Kalyāṇabataka with the Pratihāra Mihira Bhoja (also known as Bhoja, or Bhūbhṛt, or Ādivarāha) of Kanauj, and the reconstruction of his glorious reign.

The real nature of the so-called invasions of Mahmud has

been shown to be mere passing raids and the important role played by the Gûrjara kings in resisting the invaders has been fully explained. Nâgabhata the founder of the Pratihâra dynasty was the first to defeat the Arab armies, and restore Gûrjaradesa to freedom. The weakening of the Gûrjara Empire helped Mahmud in his early successes but finally the Emperor Bhoja Paramâra of the one of the branches of Gûrjara with the help of Bhima Chalukya of Anahilwada Patan accounted for Mahmud. The Gûrjara not only defended their homeland successfully against pressing invaders but defeated Qutub-ud-din who had advanced to Pîlîpâ. Gûrjara was the last power to resist the Muslims and after the fall of the Gûrjara no power was left in North India to face the invaders. The Retrospect at the end of the book analyses the causes that led to the collapse of North India under the Muslim invaders and is thought-provoking.

Here then is a briefly detailed estimate of Munshi's contribution to Indological studies in this country. And even from this it will be clear that though his work has not been very extensive it has been of vital importance. One feels that if only Munshi had more time to spare for such work he would certainly be one of the top-ranking Indologists. But that may have even so many pursuits that he simply cannot find time to concentrate on scholarship and research. Even so the surprise is that he has found time to do this much important work which bears the characteristic marks of his activities—namely thorough knowledge of the subject, firm grasp of details, lucid exposition, and pleasant presentation. May his work prove to be a source of unerring guide and abundant inspiration to all others in the field!

Our homage to Shri Munshi — the happy breeder of rich research!

JINA HAYA MUNI
R. C. MAJUMDAR
A. D. PURALKER
J. H. DAVE
V. N. BHUSHAN
R. V. PATHAK,
H. C. BHAYANI

— C O N T E N T S —

AUTHOR	CONTRIBUTION	PAGE
Dr. A S Altekar	Ancient Indian Polity and Modern Constitutional Problems	1
Dr V M Apte	Is Diti in the Ṛgveda a mere reflex of Aditi ?	14
Prof B M Barua	Aśoka's Examples Their formative influence	23
Prof U C. Bhattacharya	Rules of Warfare in Epic India	37
Dr S S Bhawe	Vikramorvaśīyam Act IV	62
Prof H C Bhayani	Abdala Rahamāna's Samdeśarāsaka and Jayasī's Padumāvati	81
Dr Enrico Gerardo Carpani	Psychology of Dream-Phenomena of Vedic Philosophy	90
Shri S N Chakravarti	The Narrative style in Early Indian Art	104
Dr Ananda K. Coomaraswamy	The Common Wisdom of the World	120
Dr S K. De	The Curtain in Ancient Indian Theatre	125
Dr G V Devasthali	Mīmāṃsā and the Modern Science of Legal Interpretation	132
Dr V G Dighe	Jamav Daftar - An Important Source for the Social History of the Marathas	143
Rao Bahadur P C Diwanji	Brahma-Ālāśa Equation Its Origin and Development	148
Prof P E Dumont	A Note on Mahābhārata 1 224 12	174
Prof. Mircea Eliade	Sapta Padāni Kramatī	180
Shri A S Gadre	The Kaṭaccuris in Western India	189
Dr D C Ganguly	On the Pratihāra Mahīpāla	194

Prof P K. Gode	The Manufacture and Use of Fire Arms in India between A D 1450 and 1850	202
Dr A. S. Gopani	Jainism in Gujarāṭa	229
Dr R. G. Harshe	Two illustrated manuscripts on Dreams	246
Shri S Venkitesubramanian Iyer	Līlāvatīśūbhi of Rāmapāpivāda	269
Prof Jagan Nath	Epigraphic Notes	277
Dr P M Joshi	The Reign of Ibrāhīm Adil Shah II of Bijapur	284
Mahamahopadhyaya P V Kane	The Problem of the Introduction of Rāśi in Indian Astronomy and Astrology	310
Dr H. R. Karnik	The Legend of the Āptya Devatās—Tritā Devitā and Ekātā	316
Shri. S. L. Katre	Harivāmin the Commentator of the Śatapatha Brāhmana : A Protégé of Vikramāditya The Great, of tradition & His Date—c. 54 B. C	325
Sardar M V Kibe	Historical facts of the personality and reign of Vikramāditya	341
Shri K. Krishna murthy	Anandavardhana's treatment of Doṣa	357
Dr B. C. Law	Slavery as known to early Buddhists	365
Dr G P Majumdar	Genesis of the Science of Medicine in Ancient India	372

ANCIENT INDIAN POLITY AND MODERN CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS

BY DR A S. ALTEKAR

Mr Kanaiyalal Munshi, in whose honour the present volume is being issued, has spent the greater part of his life and energy in discovering and interpreting Ancient Indian Culture and in striving to accelerate the progress of the motherland towards the goal of political independence. It would, therefore, be but appropriate that the volume should have a paper describing the general features of Ancient Indian Polity, making its critical and impartial estimate and discussing the lessons it has to teach to us, which may be valuable now in the task of constitution-making in which the country is at present engaged. We propose to attempt this in the present paper.

A General Estimate

We shall first proceed to form a general estimate of the ancient Indian polity and its achievements. While doing so, we shall take an absolutely impartial standpoint. We must not, however, forget that ancient kings and institutions cannot be judged by standards then not known anywhere. We must make due allowance for the circumstances and surroundings in which the Hindu polity and administration were working and then form our estimate of it. We shall also state briefly the lessons deducible from our general survey and estimate; they can be of use for the present and the future.

Several types of states like republics, oligarchies, diarchies and monarchies were prevailing in India in ancient times, but eventually monarchy became the order of the day. This phenomenon was not peculiar to ancient India, it repeated itself in ancient Europe also where we find the republics in Greece and Italy being gradually supplanted by monarchies and empires. Representative government was not known both to the ancient east and west, and so republics

could prosper only when the state was small and a meeting of its Assembly consisting practically of all the senior members of its privileged order was possible. As in the ancient republics of Greece and Rome political power was vested not in the whole population but in the members of a small privileged order mostly consisting of Kṣatriyas and perhaps of the Brāhmanas also in a few cases. The Hindu polity worked in a society that had accepted the principles of the caste system which laid down that government was primarily the function and duty of the Kṣatriyas assisted to some extent by the Brāhmanas. Franchise in the ancient Indian republics could therefore not be extended to the whole population. In the modern age which does not believe in the predetermination of one's functions by birth it will naturally have to be extended to all.

Democracy is the order of the day at present and we all hope to have a full-fledged republic in India in the near future. It will be therefore necessary to understand the causes that led to the disappearance of the republics in ancient India. Generally speaking republics could function successfully in ancient India in smaller states. They also presupposed a kind of tribal unity in the governing class; republics failed to develop into a purely territorial state of large dimensions. Distances are annihilated now; the principle of representative government has been discovered and is in universal practice. Tribal stage has been passed away long ago and we have now developed a national consciousness. There is therefore no reason why India should not function and flourish as a large republic.

Growing veneration for a hereditary ruler fostered by the principle of the divinity of king was also partly responsible for the disappearance of the ancient republics. When presidents, generals and members of the council became hereditary in republics their polity could not be much differentiated from monarchy. Divinity of king is now a dead doctrine and we need not apprehend that it will prejudice the development of the republican spirit or institutions in the modern times except perhaps in the Indian states where the monarchical

traditions are still nourished Ancient Indian polity, however, conceded divinity only to virtuous, conscientious and able rulers, who acted as real trustees for their subjects, and who were prepared to sacrifice their own interests, comforts and funds to promote the well-being of their subjects Monarchy can continue in Indian states only if their subjects are convinced that their monarchs belong to the above category Our political thinkers, it should not be forgotten, condemn incapable, vicious and tyrannical kings as demons incarnate and permit their subjects to dethrone them, and even to kill them

A study of ancient Indian history and polity shows that our republics flourished as long as there was harmony and concord among the members of their Assemblies There was, however, a tendency among them to quarrel. In some republics every member of the Assembly was given the title of *rājā*, often he was not inclined to accept the leadership of a fellow-member, because it presupposed his own inferiority Neighbouring kings used to send spies to foment quarrels and dissensions among the members of the republican bodies. Groups and parties were often formed in the republican assemblies and they spent their time and energy in bringing each other's downfall and incidentally paving the way of an outside conqueror Many of the ancient Indian republics were destroyed by the neighbouring kings and emperors by encouraging feuds and dissensions among the members of their Assemblies The party defeated in the Assembly would often seek outside help and thus seek the ruin of the state Modern India, which seeks to develop republican traditions and institutions may well carve on the gate of its future Parliamentary House the prophesy of the Buddha about the Licchavi republic The republic of the Licchavis, said the Buddha, will prosper as long as the members of their Assembly meet frequently, show reverence to age, experience and ability, transact the state business in concord and harmony and do not develop selfish parties engaged in eternal wrangling for their narrow and selfish ends Our modern legislators must never forget this warning if the Indian republic is to prosper.

In the course of time monarchy became the order of the day owing to the causes already explained. It cannot be denied that our political writers have placed the highest possible ideals before the kingly order: they can be hardly improved in modern times. The king was to be *dhyatavata* pledged to maintain and defend law, order, justice and morality; he was not above the law but subject to its jurisdiction. He was to be something even more than a trustee for his subjects; a trustee has merely to abstain from taking any undue advantage of his position while promoting the interest of the trust; the king according to the ancient Indian ideals has to sacrifice his own personal comforts and interests in order to secure the prosperity of the kingdom. Divinity was conceded not to the *person* but to the *office* of the king. The theory that a king can do no wrong and is accountable to none but God was never advocated in ancient India as in medieval Europe. Attention of the king was pointedly drawn to the great necessity of proper training, the absence of which was sure to land him into numerous pit falls that do not come across the path of an ordinary individual. The doctrine of the divinity of the king's office was intended merely to inspire respect for authority and not to encourage autocracy or irresponsibility in the kingly order.

It must be however admitted that in actual practice many kings failed to live up to the ideal. The percentage of vicious or tyrannical kings in ancient India was however by no means higher than in medieval or modern Europe. It would be however useful to understand the causes that were responsible for the non-realisation of the ideal of kingship in a large number of cases.

Failure to develop proper secular and constitutional checks on the power of the king was the main reason for the kingly ideals not being frequently realised in practice. Like medieval political thinkers of Europe our ancient Indian thinkers did no doubt not say that a bad king was accountable to God alone. Nevertheless in actual practice the fear of hell was the only effective deterrent in the case of a tyrant. Our writers no doubt permit subjects to migrate *en masse* from

the country, if the king became oppressive, ancient inscriptions supply some instances of kings being brought to their senses by this method. This remedy, however, is a very impracticable one and could not be easily resorted to. They also sanction regicide in extreme cases. Regicide, however, presupposes an open and successful rebellion, as a remedy against day-to-day petty cases of tyranny, it is altogether impracticable and inapplicable. Ancient Indian polity failed to develop secular and practicable remedies which could control the actions of a king, who was inclined to disregard the ideal and become tyrannical.

This failure was largely due to the disappearance of the *samiti* or Popular Assembly in the post-Vedic period. As long as this Assembly functioned, it could effectively control the actions of the king in the day-to-day administration. The Vedic literature makes it quite clear that a king could succeed in maintaining himself on the throne only so long as his *samiti* or Popular Assembly was in agreement with him. If there was a disagreement, the views of the Assembly generally prevailed, and kings had to submit or abdicate and go into exile.

Popular Assemblies, however, gradually disappeared in the post-Vedic period, not because democracy became more and more unsuitable to the Indian temperament, but because the state became bigger and bigger in size rendering the meetings of a Central Assembly more and more impracticable. Had Aśoka, Candragupta or Harsa revived the Central Assembly, its members would have had to spend several weeks in reaching the capital in order to attend the Assembly meetings, and an equally long time in returning to their homes. The principle of representative government was also unknown in those days, both in the east and the west.

It is possible to try the experiment of a limited and constitutional monarchy in the modern Indian states, if the Popular and Representative Assemblies are allowed to function as in the Vedic period. Members of the princely order will have to remember that they will have to submit or abdicate and go into exile, if they cannot carry their Assembly with them.

Effective popular Central Assemblies being found impracticable in the case of larger kingdoms ancient Indian political thinkers tried to protect the interests of the people by recommending and bringing about a great decentralisation of the functions of the government. Large powers were vested in the district town and village administrations, which could be effectively supervised and controlled by local non-official councils. In the Gupta period the sale of even the waste lands owned by the state required the sanction of the popular district council. The powers of town and village councils in ancient India were probably more extensive than those of similar bodies in any other polity eastern or western ancient or modern. They collected the revenues on behalf of the Central Government, refused to collect oppressive taxes, settled village disputes, organised works of public utility and often maintained and financed hospitals, poor houses and educational institutions. It would be worth-while in the new Indian constitution to entrust larger and larger powers to the district boards and local and village councils. A word of warning however must be given. The village councils worked successfully in the past because the people had a high regard for truth and character and were instinctively inclined to respect age, experience and ability. Members of the village councils were not elected; they were raised to that position by the consensus of public opinion. Democracy of the modern type involving voting and party alignments did not exist and is new to India. It presupposes wide spread of education which must be immediately brought about. Fear of God and hell which has now disappeared must be replaced by the sense of civic duty which must induce our elected representatives to place the good of the people they represent above every thing else.

Village Panchayats of ancient India exercised wide judicial powers. They decided practically all cases excepting those of serious crimes. Life in ancient times was simple. Judicial disputes were usually confined to local parties and transactions and the law to be administered was known to and understood by all. Modern law is complicated and presup-

poses technical knowledge and assistance, parties to a dispute may often belong to distinct places. Village Panchayats in modern times cannot, therefore, successfully exercise that wide civil jurisdiction which they did in the past. Nevertheless a beginning must be made by investing them with a limited civil jurisdiction. It will be difficult for witnesses to tell brand lies in the presence of their fellow residents in the Panchayat courts, with reference to events and transactions well known to the locality. The revival of the Village Panchayat courts will no doubt secure speedier justice. There will be, however, some uphill task. The faith in God and the dread of hell that helped the cause of justice in ancient times are rapidly dying out. Party factions are cropping up in villages due to illiteracy and selfishness. So until a proper sense of civic duty and responsibility is developed to replace the faith in god and fear of hell, there will be some difficulty in the successful working of the Village Panchayats.

Ancient India sought to solve the problem of the finance of the local bodies by localising a part of the land revenue. Most of the villages could get back about 15 to 20% of the proceeds of the land-tax, which they collected for the Central Government, as its contribution to the funds of the village councils. This experiment is well worth trying in modern times.

There can be no doubt that ancient Indian political thinkers had evolved excellent principles for taxation. The grounds on which remissions were sanctioned and exemptions granted were also, as a rule, sound. All will agree that the state should gather the taxes like the bee which sucks the honey without damaging the flower, that trade and industry should be taxed not on gross earnings, but on net profits, that an article should not be taxed twice, that the rise in taxation when inevitable, should be gradual and so on. The principles of exemption were also sound. The original idea was to grant exemption only to learned but poor Brāhmanas, who used to impart free education. In some cases this privilege was abused, but the states usually did not fail to levy taxes on Brāhmaṇa traders and government servants. The cases where

the whole Brāhmana class was exempted were very exceptional. In modern times we cannot and should not revive such a concession to any wholesale class determined solely by birth.

The taxation was usually determined by the local customs and traditions. In the later times however when the *samitis* disappeared from the scene governments would often impose high and arbitrary taxes. We often find tugs of war between the central governments which wanted to levy new and oppressive taxes and the village committees which would refuse to collect them. Very often however power prevailed and justice went to the wall. We find villagers migrating *en masse* to escape unbearable taxation. There can be no doubt that in later times the interests of the average man in the sphere of taxation were not adequately protected when a greedy tyrant was on the throne. This happened primarily because there was no *samiti* or popular assembly in later times. The importance of a strong and vigilant Popular Assembly as a champion of popular rights and interests cannot be over-emphasised.

The ancient Indian state was not merely a tax-gathering corporation interested only in preserving law and order. It is pleasing and surprising to find that the state in ancient India should have interested itself in a number of ministrant activities of the nation-building type which are being undertaken by the modern governments only in relatively recent times. Individual enterprise and initiative was, however, not usually affected by the activities of the state because it would usually utilise the services of the guilds of trade and industry to carry out its policy. Freedom was also given to experts to chalk out their own plans within certain reasonable limits, and the state would give them substantial subsidies to carry them out if they contributed to further its nation-building activities. This undoubtedly is a pleasing characteristic of the ancient Indian polity. State for instance helped education by giving liberal grants to non-official colleges and universities. It did not care to dictate their policy or courses through a Director of Public Instruction. The growing sphere of state socialism threatens to create a conflict between the individual

Chapter I

Siddharāja and the Jains.

Siddharāja was an enlightened ruler on the throne of Anahilavāda. During his reign as well as that of his successor, no man was disabled from holding any office under the crown by reason of his race, language or religion. In other words, career was thrown open to talents, and the talented Jains captured many important offices in the state. Munjāla, Śantu, Udayana, Āsuka, Vagbhata, Ānanda, Prithvipāla and Sajjana, were some of the Jain officers who helped Jayasimhadeva in state affairs¹

Munjāla was a minister of king Karna and continued to hold office under Siddharāja. Karna had married Mayanalladevī as his mother desired him to do so, but had not favoured her even with a look. Once he happened to see a woman

¹ Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, p. 224

of low rank and wished to enjoy her. He was, however not able to do so as he thought the act below his dignity. His minister Munjala coming to know of this dressed up Mayanalladevi in that woman's clothes and sent her after usual monthly ablutions to take the place of that woman. Karna thinking that she was the very woman he loved received her ardently and she became pregnant by him. Mayanalladevi had as a proof of the interview taken from her husband his ring. Next day, Karna repented for his sinful deed but his minister Munjala explained to him the stratagem by which he was deceived. In this way Munjala saved the king from a fall and won Mayanalladevi's secret blessings.¹ This account of Merutunga is not confirmed by a contemporary writer.

On another occasion, Munjala helped Jayasimhaddeva Karna's son. When the siege of Dhara was indefinitely prolonged, Siddharaja took a vow to refrain from food until he had captured the fort of Dhara. The warriors of Gujarat showed great prodigies of valour but were unable to fulfil the king's vow before the end of the day. At this time Munjala intervened, and persuaded

¹ Merutunga *Prabandāchintāmaṇi*, p. 183; Jina-mandana *Kumārāpūlaprabandha*, p. 4.

Siddharāja to fulfil his vow by breaking into Dhārā made of flour³

Munjāla is said to have taken an important part in the capture of Dhārā. When Siddharāja was thinking of raising the siege of Dhārā, he posted his confidential emissaries in all the important places in the city. They all began to talk on the capture of Dhārā, and by this device succeeded in knowing that an attack on the southern gate would crown their labours with success. The king, knowing this fact, brought his army to the southern gate tower of the fort, and headed the assault in person. His elephant Yaśah-pataha, then, broke two of the three gates. Siddharāja entered the city, and taking Yaśovarman prisoner, returned to Anahilavada⁴.

Jayasimha's victory over Yaśovarman of Mālwa is certainly historical. It is confirmed by the Chaulukya copperplates wherein Jayasimha is called Avantinātha as well as by Hemachandra, Arisimha, Someśvara and other chroniclers⁵. As Munjāla was a minister of Siddharāja, it is credible, as

3 Tawney, *Prabandhachintāmaṇi*, p. 86. 4 Tawney, *Prabandhachintāmaṇi*, pp. 86-7. 5 Prasasti to the *Siddha-Hema*, v. 18, *Sukritasāhityatana*, II, 34, *Kīrti-Kaumudī*, II, 31-32.

Merutunga says that he played an important part in the capture of Dhāra

After taking Dhāra Siddharāja had taken a vow that he would enter Anahilavada, mounted on an elephant, with Yaśovarman holding an unsheathed sword in hand on the back seat of the howdah. Minister Munjāla coming to know this pointed out to the king the risk he had undertaken by taking that vow. The king was unwilling to break his vow but Munjāla persuaded him to fulfil it by giving in Yaśovarman's hand a wooden sword.

Santu or Sampatkara was another Jain prime minister of Siddharāja. He was the prime minister of Karna also. He was probably a native of Baroda. His father's name was Varnaga and mother's name Sampuri. In the beginning of his career he was a governor of Lata in Broach. By sheer dint of merit he rose to the rank of the chief minister of Karna. The Karnasundari of Bilhana was acted in his temple. His engrossment in state affairs—so much so that he has no time to talk to his children or his newly married wives—his proficiency in state craft and his success in political affairs are specially mentioned by

Bilhana " He is described as surpassing even famous ministers like Yaugandharāyana of the past. He had sent an army under general Sachchika to fight the Sultan of Ghazani whom it defeated on the banks of the Indus^{6A}. This event is not confirmed by other evidence.

Śāntu is said to have put an end to the tyranny of Madanapāla, maternal uncle of King Karna, by compassing his death. When Siddharāja had been on a pilgrimage to Somanātha, the reins of Government were in Śāntu's hands. Taking advantage of the king's absence from the capital, the king of Mālwa invaded Gujarāta. Śāntu asked him the condition on which he would turn back. Yaśovarman told him that if he made over to him the merit which Siddharāja gained by his pilgrimage to the shrine of Somanātha he would return. The minister, then, washed the king's feet and throwing into the hollow of his hand a handful of water as a sign of the transference of that merit, induced the king of Mālwa to retire. When Siddharāja knew this, he became very angry. But his minister propitiated him by saying that the giving away of one's

6A *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, II, pp CXCI 7 Merutunga, *Prabandhachintāmaṇi*, p 135.

merit had no meaning and that one must try to avoid the enemy knocking at the door⁸

The King of Malwa who invaded Gujarat in Siddharaja's absence was Narvarman and not Yashovarman. Moreover Merutunga's statement that the lord of Malwa was induced to retire by making over to him the merit of Siddharaja's pilgrimage to the shrine of Somanatha is of doubtful validity—probably it was gold that induced him to turn back. It must however be said to the credit of Santu that he knew how to avoid the enemy knocking at the door.

Merutunga tells a story which gives us an insight into the character of Santu. Once when minister Santu went to pray to God in a Jain temple built by him he saw a Jain monk in the company of a prostitute. He paid obeisance to him according to the rules of his faith sat near him for some time and went his way. The Jain monk was so much ashamed that he sincerely repented for his conduct went to Palitana and practised austere penance for twelve years. After some years when Santu went on a pilgrimage to Palitana, he paid obeisance to the same monk and asked him who his Guru was. The

⁸ Ibid, p. 142.

monk replied that minister Śāntu was his guru because he had helped him to follow the right path⁹

The story shows that Śāntu did not disclose the faults of others and gave an opportunity to the wrongdoer to improve. He was aware of many examples of the futility of criticism bristling on a thousand pages of history and so refrained from it. Under similar circumstances, the Jains of to-day should follow the example of Śāntu and give the wrongdoer an opportunity to improve.

Udayana was another Jain officer of Siddharāja. He was a Śrīmālī Baniā of Mārwar. At the suggestion of some persons, he went to Karnāvatī and put up at the place of a printer named Lāchhī. Fortune smiled upon him and he found much money. In course of time, he won name, fame and glory and became a minister.¹⁰ Siddharāja appointed him governor of Cambay. When Hemachandra entered the order of Jain monks, he attended the ceremony. According to the *Prabandhachintāmanī*, it was he who persuaded Chāchiga, Hemachandra's father, to consent to

9 *Prabandhachintāmanī* (Shastri's Translation), pp 162-3 10 *Ibid*, pp 161-2

merit had no meaning and that one must try to avoid the enemy knocking at the door⁸

The King of Malwa who invaded Gujarat in Siddharaja's absence was Narvarman and not Yajoverman. Moreover Merutunga's statement that the lord of Malwa was induced to retire by making over to him the merit of Siddharaja's pilgrimage to the shrine of Somenatha is of doubtful validity probably it was gold that induced him to turn back. It must, however be said to the credit of Santu that he knew how to avoid the enemy knocking at the door

Merutunga tells a story which gives us an insight into the character of Santu. Once when minister Santu went to pray to God in a Jain temple built by him he saw a Jain monk in the company of a prostitute. He paid obeisance to him according to the rules of his faith sat near him for some time and went his way. The Jain monk was so much ashamed that he sincerely repented for his conduct went to Palitana and practised austere penance for twelve years. After some years when Santu went on a pilgrimage to Palitana he paid obeisance to the same monk and asked him who his Guru was. The

⁸ Ibid, p 142.

ved to the camp where his soldiers finding him weeping bitterly, asked him to break his mind. The minister told them that as he was dying before having rebuilt the temples of Vimalāchala and Bhrigucatchha, he could not contain his grief. His soldiers told him that his sons Vāgbhata and Āmrabhata would carry out his plans. Udayana then asked them to call to his presence an ascetic that he might confess all his sins before him. They, however, not finding one, disguised a servant as an ascetic and carried him to the minister. Udayana then made his final act of faith and passed away.¹⁴ When Kumārapāla heard of Udayana's death, he was much grieved.¹⁵ Udayana is said to have built Udayanavihara in Karnāvati.

Another Jain minister of Siddharāja was Āsuka. He was, beyond doubt, a Mahamatya or prime minister between V S. 1179 and 1181 or

ana, Kumārapālprabandha, p. 71) Their evidence cannot weigh against that of a contemporary writer who gives the credit of defeating the Saurashtra chiefs to Ālhana of Nadul (Epig Ind, IX, p. 68).
 14 Merutunga, Prabandhachintāmanī, p. 218, Charitrasundar-Kumārapālacharit, VI (IV) 23-30 Jinamandana, Kumārapālprabandha, p. 71. 15 Charitrāsundara, loc. cit., VI, (17) 23.

the consecration of his son¹¹ In the time of Kumārapala he led an unsuccessful expedition against the king of Saurashtra (but died in the war). He was known as the maternal uncle of Siddharaja. He built the fort of Jhinjhwada.¹²

Udayana was an excellent follower of Jina. When he was sent against the king of Sorath he kept his army in Vardhamanapur and went to Vimalachala. While worshipping the Jineśvara he saw a rat with a burning wick entering a hole in the wooden temple. The animal was prevented by the temple servant from carrying the wick in hole but Udayana apprehending danger to the wooden temple made up his mind to build a stone temple and vowed to take only one meal till the task was accomplished. Then he joined his camp and marched against Sunara. In a battle that followed the imperial forces were defeated and Udayana was mortally wounded.¹³ He was remo-

11 Ibid, p 205 12 Desai *Jain Sahityaśi Itihāsa*, p 224 13 Merutunga *Prabandācharya*, p 217 The later chroniclers however say that when the imperial forces were defeated Udayana personally went against Sunara and slew him in a hard fought duel (Charitra-sundara *Kumarpālacharit* VI (IV), 20-22; Jaysimha *Kumarpālacharit* VIII, 495-500; Jinamand

'Ganadharas' or the principal disciples of Jina. The enclosure in which the temple stands contains small cells with images of Jina. On the southern side, there is a small temple with two black images. Behind these images, there is an apartment containing a large white marble image held in great veneration by the Jains. It has a small hole in the shoulder said to have been caused by water that used to fall from the ear, whence it obtained the name *Amiḥarā*.

According to the commentator of the *Vāgbhatāṅkārā* *Vāgbhata* was a prime minister of *Jayasimhadeva*. He was probably a son of *Udayana*. He is often confused with *Vāgbhata*, author of the *Vāgbhatāṅkārā* and son of *Soma*¹⁸. *Ananda* was another Jain prime minister of *Siddharāja*¹⁹.

Chandrasūri, the author of the *Munisuvrata charitra*, was the governor of *Lata* before he entered the order of Jain monks²⁰.

Siddharāja was a patron of learning and the learned. He had a great thirst for knowledge. As the Jain monks were very well-known for

18 *Vāgbhatāṅkārā*, v 148 19 *Prāchīna Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, 381 20 *Desai, Jain Sahitya Itihasa* v 226

A. D 1122-23 and 1124-5 He attended the famous debate between Devasūri and Kumudachandra. With his advice and assent Jayasimha made a pilgrimage to the Śatrunjaya hill and gave a grant of twelve villages to the temple of Adinatha¹⁶

Sajjana was another Jain officer of Siddharaja. After the conquest of Sorath he was appointed governor of the province. This is confirmed by an inscription in Nemnatha's temple built by him on Giranara¹⁷

Sajjana's temple on Giranara is the largest temple on this hill. It was repaired in A. D 1278. It stands in a quadrangular court about 190 ft. by 130 ft. It consists of two halls. The garbhagriha has a large image in black stone of Nemnatha the twenty-second Tirthankara. The principal mandapa in front of this has twenty-square columns of granite. The floor is marbled. Round the shrine is a passage or 'bhamati' containing many images in white marble. The outer hall has two large raised platforms the upper slabs of which have a close grained yellow stone covered with representations of the feet of the

¹⁶ Desai, *Jain Sahitya ko Itihasa*, p. 225 ¹⁷ Bom Gaz. I (1) p 176

'Ganadharas' or the principal disciples of Jina. The enclosure in which the temple stands contains small cells with images of Jina. On the southern side, there is a small temple with two black images. Behind these images, there is an apartment containing a large white marble image held in great veneration by the Jains. It has a small hole in the shoulder said to have been caused by water that used to fall from the ear, whence it obtained the name *Amjharā*.

According to the commentator of the *Vāgbhatāṅkārā*, Vāgbhata was a prime minister of Jayasimhadeva. He was probably a son of Udayana. He is often confused with Vāgbhata, author of the *Vāgbhatāṅkārā* and son of Soma¹⁸. Ananda was another Jain prime minister of Siddharāja¹⁹.

Chandrasūri, the author of the *Munisuvrata charitra*, was the governor of Lāta before he entered the order of Jain monks²⁰.

Siddharāja was a patron of learning and the learned. He had a great thirst for knowledge. As the Jain monks were very well-known for

18 *Vāgbhatāṅkārā*, v 148 19 *Prāchīna Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, 381 20 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, p 226

their learning, he invited many of them to his assembly of the learned and treated them as his personal friends. Among his learned friends was Viracharya a Jain monk.

According to the *Prabhāvakacharita* Jayasimha, in the course of a friendly conversation told Viracharya that the greatness of the learned depended upon royal patronage Viracharya's self-respect was wounded and so he went to Pali in Marwar Jayasimha repented for his conduct and requested the Śūri to return to his capital Viracharya did so after an extensive tour in different parts of India in course of which he defeated several dialecticians—especially Buddhists He was moreover highly honoured by the king of Gwālior²¹

A dialectician of the Sāṃkhya school named Vādisimha paid a visit to Anahilapura and challenged the learned men of the city to meet him in a public debate Jayasimha who was very jealous of the honour of his kingdom in matters of learning approached Viracharya's guru who sent Viracharya to fight him The Jain Ācharya is also said to have defeated one Kamalakīrti, a Digambara dialectician²² Another learned Jain monk who at times attended Siddharaja's assembly

²¹ *Prabhāvakacharita* pp. 264-6 ²² *Ibid* pp. 266-7

assembly of the learned was Devasūri. He was born at Maddahrit in Ashtadaśasati in V. Samvat 1143 (A. D. 1086-7)²³ He was a Porwad Bania. His father's name was Viranāga and mother's name Jinadevī. Before he entered the order of Jain monks, he was known as Purnachandra. When he was eight years old, his father migrated to Broach. After a year, Munichandra, a Jain monk, made Purnachandra his disciple. Viranāga was given an annuity by the Jains of Broach.²⁴

When Purnachandra entered the order of Jain monks, he came to be known as Ramachandra. He studied logic and Pramāṇaśāstra and won victories in various debates. In Dholkā, he defeated a dialectician named Bandha of the Saivadvaita school.²⁵ According to the *Mudritakumudachandra*, however, it was Munichandra, Devasūri's guru, who defeated the Saiva dialectician. It may be that Devachandra might have taken prominent part in helping his guru in the debate with Saivadvaita.²⁶

23 The region about Abu was in those days known as Ashtadaśasati. Maddahrit is probably modern Madna, near Abu. 24 *Prabhāvakaśharita*, pp. 270-72. 25 *Ibid* p. 272. 26 *Kavyānuśāsana*, II, C O I L

Prabhāchandra moreover gives him the credit of defeating Gunachandra a Digambara, in Nagpura. This victory of Devasūri is confirmed by the *Mudratakumudachandra* 27

According to the *Prabhāvakacharita* Devasūri also defeated Sivabhuti in Chitor Gangadhara in Gwalior Dharamdhara in Dhara and Krishna in Broach.²⁸ These victories of Devasūri are not confirmed by the other chroniclers

According to the same authority Vimalachandra Harichandra Somachandra Parivachandra and Anokachandra were Devasūri's learned friends 29

In V samvat 1174 the dignity of Ācharya was conferred on him. Since then he was known as Devasūri. In Dholaka he performed the opening ceremony of Udayashti, a temple built by Udaya and set up the image of Simandharaswami in it.³⁰

His love for his preceptor was very great. Once when he was going to Sapadalaksha desa he came to know that his guru was not well. So he returned to Anahilapura and served his preceptor till his death in V Samvat 1178

27 Ibid p. C O I L. 21 *Prabhāvakacharita*, p. 372.
 28 Ibid p. 372. 30 Ibid, pp. 372-3. 31 Ibid p. 372.

When he was at Anahilapura, Devabodha, a foreign scholar, challenged the learned men of the city to tell him the meaning of a verse in Sanskrit. When no body could explain the verse, Devasūri silenced Devabodha by telling him the meaning of the verse ³²

In V Samvat 1179, the sūri performed the opening ceremony of a Jain temple built by Bahada in Anahilavāda ³³ We do not know who this Bahada was He might have been the son of Udayana, but nothing can be said with certainty.

Devasūri then went to Nāgor Devabodha who happened to be there, praised him very much before king Alhadana who received the sūri with great honour ³⁴

In V S 1180 (A D 1124), Devasuri lived in Karnāvatī in the temple of Aristanemi during the four months of the rainy season and acquired for him great fame as a learned man by his stirring sermons Kumudachandra, a Digambara dialectician who had won several logical disputes, was at that time in Karnāvatī He was a southerner and the guru of Jayakeśin, king of Karnatak and maternal grand father of Siddharaja He was the incarna-

32 Ibid, pp 273-4 33 Ibid, p. 274. 34 Ibid, p. 275

tion of pride. He tied to his left foot marionettes of several dialecticians whom he defeated. According to the *Mudrarakshasandhara* his opponents included Buddhist, Bhatta Mimamsakas followers of Sankara and Kapilas. It is difficult to say how much historical truth there is in this narration. We know however that Digambara Jainism was then rich in philosophers and dialecticians of a very high order some of whose works have survived to this day. It is credible therefore that Kumudachandra who had come from the Deccan to win name and fame in Gujarat may have won some logical disputes in the Deccan.²⁵

Hearing of Devasūri's fame Kumudachandra went to Devasūri's residence and throw grass and water in it. Devasūri at first did not mind the vauntings of Kumudachandra and rather tried to control his anger. But his co-religionists and disciples did not like to put up with the insult; so when an old man was harassed by Kumudachandra Devasūri was roused to fight. He told Kumudachandra that he would hold a discussion with him at the Court of Jayasimha in Anshilavada. Kumudachandra readily accepted

²⁵ Merutunga, *Prabandhasamgraha* pp. 161-3; *Prabandhasamgraha* pp. 276-7

his invitation and went to Anahilavāda where he was well-received by the king. Devasūri, also, went to Anahilavāda ³⁶

As Kumudachandra was the preceptor of Mayanalladevi's father, she was doing her best to ensure his victory by giving presents to principal men of the Court Hemachandra, coming to know of this, represented to her that in the debate that would follow, the Digambaras would denounce whereas the Svetambaras would uphold the good deeds done by women When Mayanalladevi came to know of this, she ceased to favour Kumudachandra, thinking him to be a man utterly unacquainted with the usages of the world ³⁷

On the day fixed for disputation, the Court was attended by learned men representing six schools of philosophy Kumudachandra had also come in great pomp and taken the seat assigned to him by Siddharaja On the other side, Devasūri and Hemachandra sat The disputants then entered into a contract by which the Svetambaras consented to adopt the views and practices of

36 Merutunga, *Prabandhachintāman*, pp 161-4. 37
Ibid, p 165

the Digambaras in case of their defeat, while the Digambaras were to leave Gujarat for the Deccan if they were vanquished.³⁸

The questions at issue were whether women and monks who put on clothes could liberate themselves. Devasūri maintained that women could liberate themselves as liberation depended upon a person possessing Sattva and women were known to possess great sattva. Instances were quoted from the Śāstras of Sita and others and as contemporary evidence the name of queen-mother Mayanalladevi was mentioned. In the course of the debate Kumudachandra challenged the propriety of the word kotakoti used by Devasūri he was however silenced by Kakala who said that the justification of the three words kotakoti kotikoti and kotīkoti was established, being set forth in the grammar of Sakatsyana.³⁹

The debate lasted for 16 days. At the end of the 16th day Kumudachandra acknowledged his defeat and had to leave the city of Anahilapura according to the terms of agreement.⁴⁰

³⁸ Ibid. pp 166-67 ³⁹ *Kāvyaśaṅkha*, II, p. 604H; *Prabandhaśālinī* pp. 155-7 ⁴⁰ Ibid pp. 166-7

Siddharāja being much pleased at this victory of Devasūri, conducted him in procession to the temple of Mahāvīra with the emblems of royalty, musical instruments and the conch-shells sounding the notes of victory Thahada, a Jain layman, held a festival to celebrate the Sūri's victory ⁴¹

Siddharāja, moreover, wanted to give much money to Devasūri, but as the latter did not accept it, a temple to Ādinatha was built at the suggestion of Āsuka, a Jain minister, in V. S. 1183-A. D. 1126-7 ⁴²

This victory of Devasūri is certainly historical Ratnaprabha, a pupil and contemporary of his, makes a reference to it in his commentary on the *Upadeśamālā* (V S 1238-A D. 1181-2) ⁴³ Munichandra also takes note of it in the *Gurvāvalī* ⁴⁴ According to Prabhāchandra, this victory was won in V S 1181-A D 1125

Devasūri wrote the *Pramānanayatattvālokāṅkāra*, *Syādvādaratnākara* and several other works. Manikyā, Asoka, Vijayasena, Bhadrēśvara and Ratnaprabha were some of his pupils. Devasūri died in 1170 A D at a ripe old age ⁴⁵

41 Ibid, pp 166 7. 42 *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* II p CC LV.

43 *Pramānanayatattvālokāṅkāra*, Introduction, p, 8 44

Ibid, introduction, p 4 45 *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, II, p CCLV.

Abhayadeva Malladhari was another learned Jain monk of the time of Siddharaja. He obtained the baruda Malladhari from king Karna or Siddharaja of Anahilavada. He was honoured by king Khengara of Saurashtra. At his suggestion a Jain temple was erected in Modeta, near Ajmer and a pilgrim tax was abolished by Raja Bhuvanapala. Prithviraja I, son of Vigraharaja III is said to have adorned a Jain temple with a golden knob at Abhayadeva's persuasion."

Abhayadevasuri a pupil of Jayasimhasuri, belonged to the Prastavahana kula Kotkagana Madhyamalakha and Harshapuriya Gachha. He was a successful missionary and helped many Brahmins to embrace Jainism. He was held in high esteem by Jayasimha king of Anahilavada whom he persuaded to forbid the destruction of life for eight days in Paryushana." According to Peterson Siddharaja and his retinue attended

46 Desai, *Jain Sahityam Itihasa*, pp. 227-9 47 Gandhi L. B. "Siddharaja and Jains" No. 8, Hiralal Hansaraj *Jain Dharmam Itihasa* I, p. 2. Peterson makes a mistake here. He says that Jayasimha forbade the destruction of life on the 8th and the 14th of the bright and dark halves of the month and the fifth of the bright half (Peterson IV App p. 8). The same mistake is repeated by Hiralal Hansaraj (Loc. Cit. I, p. 4) and in the *Abhidharmajendra*, p. 707

the Sūri's funeral procession,⁴⁸ but the fact is that Siddharāja and his retinue only witnessed the procession from the palace window.⁴⁹

The Sūri lived a life of self-restraint. He performed austere penance and abstained from rich food.⁵⁰

Vardhamānācārya, pupil of the famous commentator Abhayadeva, wrote the Ādināthā-
charita in A. D. 1104 in the glorious reign
of Siddharāja. It is divided into five parts and
contains 11 000 verses. The whole is in Prakrit,
but at times, Apabhramsa is used. It is a very
big work on the life of Ādinātha, the first
Tirthankara. Our author's other works are
Manoramācharitra (A. D. 1083-4) and *Dharma-
ratnakurandavrittā* (A. D. 1115-16).⁵¹

Sāntisūri, a pupil of Vardhamānasūri of
Purnatallagatchha, wrote commentaries on five
works.⁵²

Another Sāntisūri was a pupil of Nemichandra.⁵³
He founded the Pippalagatchha. He is known

48 Peterson, V, pp 13 and 30 49 Gandhi, "Siddharaja
and Jains", No 8 50 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*,
p 229 51 Dalal, *Jesalmara Catalogue*, introduction, p 45.
52 Desai, loc cit, p 230 53 Peterson, V, p 117

as the author of the *Prithvichandracharitra* which he wrote at the request of his pupil Munichandra in A. D. 1105 Bhandarkar puts this work to the credit of Nemichandra but it is a mistake which is apparent from what is written at the end of the work⁵⁴

Jinavallabhasūri occupies an important place among the monks of the Kharataragachha. He was a pupil of Abhayadevasūri. He had many followers in Chitod and Vagad. King Naravarman of Dhara honoured him. Jinavallabha became a sūri in 1110-11 A. D. and died after six months.⁵⁵

He is said to have written the *Sukshmarthasiddhāntavichārasāra*⁵⁶ *Āgamitavastuvichārasāra*⁵⁷ *Pindaturuddhiprakarana*⁵⁸ *Sanghapattaka Dharmaśikshā Pramottarakataka Chitralakṣya-prasasti Bhavanvāranasotra Paushadhavidhiprakarana Jinakalyānakasotra*⁵⁹ and *Pratikramanasādhakāra*. The Jain Granthakāvali ascribes to him several more; but we cannot positively say that they are his works.

⁵⁴ Peterson V p. LXX; Bhandarkar Second Report etc p. 27; Dalal, *Jaisalmer Catalogue* introduction p. 46. ⁵⁵ Desai loc. cit. pp. 230-31 ⁵⁶ Peterson, I 28 ⁵⁷ Peterson I 27 ⁵⁸ Peterson I 63. ⁵⁹ Dalal, *Jaisalmer Catalogue* introd pp. 40-41.

Jinadattasūri, a pupil of Jinavallabhasūri, converted many Rajputs. He is said to have written the *Ganadharasārdhaśataka*, *Sandehadolāvali*, *Ganadharasaptati*, *Sarvādhisthāyīstotra*, *Sugurupāratantrya*, *Vighnavināśīstotra*, *Avasthākulaka*, *Chaityavandanakulaka*, *Upadesarasāyana* and *Kālasvarupakulaka* ⁶⁰

Rāmadevagani, another pupil of Jinavallabhasūri, is said to have written some commentaries. Jinabhadrasūri is said to have composed the *Apavarganāmamāla*—*Panchavargaparīhāranāmamāla* ⁶¹

Dhanadeva, a Jain layman, is said to have built a Jain temple in Nāgor at the suggestion of Jinavallabhasūri ⁶²

Śrīpāla From an inscription on an image in the temple of Vimala Shah on Mt Ābu, we learn that the poet Śrīpāla belonged to the Prāgvata race and that his father's name was Shri Lakshmana. We find confirmation of these facts in the *Kumārāpālāpratibodha* ⁶³ From the *Vadana-garaprasasti* of Kumārāpāla, we know that Śrīpāla was famed for composing a great prabandha

60 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihāsa*, p. 233 61 Ibid, p. 233; *Jesalmira catalogue*, 64 62 Desai, loc cit, p. 233. 63 *Kāvyañuśāsana*, II, pp. COLVI-VII

(Literary work) in a day that he was accepted as a brother by Siddharaja and that he was called a king of poets. The poet had written *prastuti* for Rudramala Sahasralinga lake and the Vairochanaparakaya. Two verses of the lake *prastuti* are quoted in the *Prabandhakirtanani*. A slab forming the part of the Kirtistambha of the lake bearing on it a fragment of the *prastuti* is discovered. Stray verses of Śrīpala have been found. From such fragmentary poems it is not possible to form an estimate of Śrīpala's poetic skill. We can, however say from the available data that Śrīpala's verses are marked by chaste and forceful diction "

Śrīpala was Siddharaja's poet laureate. He was not on good terms with Devabodha a favourite of Siddharaja. Unfortunately he was blind.

Viragani, a pupil of Ishwaragani of Ohandragatohha or Sarwalagatohha wrote a commentary on the *Pindanvryakṭi*. The work contains 7961 verses. It was composed in Dadhipadra or Dahod in V. S. 1169 or A. D. 1112-18. Mahendrasūri, Parādevagani and Devachandragani were his colleagues. Viragani's second name was Samudragoṣhasūri. Before he entered the order of

Jain monks, he was known as Vasanta. He was a native of Vatapadrakapura (Baroda) in Lāṭa-deśa. He belonged to Dharkata Kula. His father's name was Vardhamāna and mother's name Śrīmati⁶⁵

Devasūri, a pupil of Virachandrasūri, wrote the *Jvānuśāsana*⁶⁶ in Prakrit. The work contains 334 verses.

Dharmaghoshasūri, pupil of Chandraprabhasūri, who founded the Purnimikagatchha, composed the *Śabdasiddhi* and *Rishimandalastavana*. Siddharāja is said to have praised him⁶⁷

Samudraghosha, a pupil of Dharmaghoshasūri, showed his proficiency in logic in Mālwa and earned name and fame at the courts of Naravarman of Dhārā, and Jayasimhadeva of Anahilavada^{67a}

Parśvadevagani was a pupil of Dhanesvarasūri who was a pupil of Śilabhadra of the Chandragatchha. He was the author of the *Nyāyapraveśakavṛttipanyākā* in A. D. 1113 and *Nishithachurnvimsoddakavṛtti* in A. D. 1117. He helped his guru Dhanesvarasūri in the Comment

65 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihas*, p. 238. 66 Peterson, v, 22. 67 Peterson, I, 93. 67a Desai, loc. cit., p. 240

ary on the *Sardhasataba* in 1171 (A. D 1114-15). He was also an ardent devotee of Sarasvatī in the reign of Kumarapala⁶⁸

Yasodevasūri wrote the *Chantyaravandanacharnavivaraṇa* in A. D 1118 and the *Pachchabhāṇa-sarutām* in A. D 1125-6⁶⁹. He is also said to have written the *Pāśhikānandravrittī* in A. D 1128-4 and the *Pindavastuddhivrittī*. He belonged to the Chandraśekhara and was a pupil of Chandraśūri.⁷⁰

Yasodeva Upādhyaya was a pupil of Devaguptasūri of Upakeśagatohha. Before he entered the order of Jain monks he was known as Dhanadeva. On receiving the dignity of Upādhyaya he came to be known as Yasodeva. He completed the *Chandraśekhara-charita* in A. D 1121-2. Dr Bhandarkar ascribes this work to Siddhasūri and puts the date of his composition in V Samvat 1188 (A. D 1081-2) but it seems to be a mistake⁷¹. This work was commenced in Āśāpalli when the author was dwelling in the temple of Paravanatha and completed in Anahilavada in the temple of Mahavira. Our author's

⁶⁸ Dalal, *Jainism's catalogue* introduction p. 21, ⁶⁹ Ibid. No. 170 (1, H). ⁷⁰ Peterson III p. c; and III app. p. 128 ⁷¹ Bhandarkar 2nd report etc., p. 28.

other works are the *Navapadaparakaranabṛihadavṛitti* in A D 1108-9 and the *Navatattvaparakaranavṛitti* in Samvat 1174 (A D. 1117-8) ⁷²

Munichandrasūri was the guru of the famous disputant Devasūri. He was trained by Vinayachandra Pāthak. He entered the order of Jain monks at an early age. Nemichandrasūri conferred the dignity of Āchārya on him. Munichandrasūri was a very learned man. He performed austere penance. Many Jain monks and nuns were at his beck and call. He was the author of the following works.—

Devendranaśākhendraparakaranavṛitti in S 1168 (A D 1111-12), *Sukshmārthavichārasārachūṛṇi* in V S. 1170 (A D 1113-14), *Anekāntajayapatākāvṛittitippanam* in V. S 1171 (A D 1114-15), *Upadeśavṛitti* in S 1174 (A D 1117-8); *Lalitavistarāpanjikā*; *Dharmabīnduvṛitti*, *Karmaprakṛititippana*

Besides the seven commentaries mentioned above, Munichandra wrote the following original works -

(1) *Angulīśaptatī* (2) *Āvaśyakaśaptatī* (3) *Vanaspatīśaptatī* (4) *Gāthākosha* (5) *Anuśāsanān-*

kutakulaka (6) Upadeśāmṛtakulaka—Parts I, II
 (7) Upadeśapanchāṣika (8) Dharmopadeśakulaka
 (in two parts) (9) Prābhāṭikastuti (10) Mokṣho-
 padēśapanchāṣika (11) Ratnatrayakulaka (12)
 Śokaharaupadeśakulaka (13) Samyaktvaipādayidhi
 (14) Sāmānyaguṇopadeśakulaka (15) Hitopadeśa-
 kulaka (16) Kālakulaka (17) Maṇḍalavicharakulaka
 (18) Dvādaśavarga.”

Munichandra is also said to have written a
 commentary of 1400 verses on the *Navakadhatōya*.
 He died in Samvat 1178 (A. D. 1123).”

Hemachandra Malladhari was a pupil of Abhaya-
 deva Malladhari of the Harahapuriyagatohha.
 Before he entered the order of Jain monks he
 was a minister. His name was Pradyumna. He
 had as many as four wives.

According to Chandrasūri, his pupil and con-
 temporary Siddharaja attended Hemachandra's
 sermons with his retinue and lent his ears to
 what the Sūri said. Even when there was no
 sermon he paid occasional visits to his mona-
 stery and talked with the Sūri for a long time.
 Once the king invited the Sūri to his palace and
 like arati waved before him flowers fruits and

materials of worship At the persuasion of the Sūri, Siddharāja set up gold knobs on the Jain temples in his kingdom and put an end to the troubles of the Jains in Dhandhukā, Sāchor and other places The king, moreover, restored the grants to Jain temples at the suggestion of Hemachandra ⁷⁴

Once Hemachandra went on a pilgrimage to Giranāra with the Jain congregation. There were 1100 carts and many horses, camels and bullocks in the congregation When the congregation halted at Vanthali, Khengār, king of Sorath, wanted to extort money from the pilgrims, so he did not allow the congregation to continue its march Hemachandra approached Khengār and obtained permission for the congregation to march ⁷⁵

He was the author of the following works —

- (1) *Āvaśyakatīppanaka*. It is a commentary on the *Āvaśyakasūtra* and contains 5000 verses.
- (2) *Śatakavīvarana* (3) *Anuyogadīvarasūtravṛtti*. It is a commentary on the *Anuyogadīvarasūtra* and contains 6000 verses (4) *Upadeśamālāsūtra* is the original work of the author Hemachandra

⁷⁴ Peterson, V, 14-16 This Hemachandra is different from Kalikālasarvagna Hemachandra ⁷⁵ Peterson, V, 14-16

has also written a commentary of 14 000 verses on the same (5) *Jivasamīśavṛtti* of 7,000 verses in V S 1164 (A. D 1107-8) in Anahilavada. (6) *Bhavabhavanāṣṭra* with a commentary of 8 000 verses in S. 1170 (A. D 1118-14). (7) *Nandāstratippanaka* (8) *Vibhāṣāyātanātra-bṛhaderitti* in S. 1175 or A. D 1118-19 It contains 28000 verses. Abhayakumārāgaṇi, Dhanadevāgaṇi Jinabhadraṇi, Lakshmanāgaṇi Vibudhaachandra Ānandasūri and Viramati helped the sūri in this work.¹⁶

Hemachandra was a popular writer. He was never dogmatic. When there was any matter involved in doubt, he frankly admitted that the truth was known to God. Man, he believed, is imperfect, and hence likely to err.

Hemachandra fasted for seven days before his death. Siddharāja attended his funeral procession and in that way showed his respect for the Sūri.¹⁷

Ānandasūri and Amaraachandrasūri were the pupils of Mahendra and Śantisūri of Nagendra

¹⁶ Gandhi, "Siddharāja and Jains" No. 19. Peterson III App. p. 155; I App. p. 91; III app. p. 176. III, App. p. 35; Weber II, p. 692; Kaelhorn, Palm Leaf Report, p. 41. ¹⁷ Peterson, V 14-15.

gatchha King Siddharāja conferred on Ānandasūri and Amarachandrasūri the 'biruds' of 'Vyagraśīśuka' and 'Simhaśīśuka' respectively, because they won victories in debates at an early age⁷⁸

Amarachandrasūri was the author of the *Siddhāntārṇava*. Haribhadrāsūri, a pupil of Ānandasūri, won the biruda 'Kalikālagautama'⁷⁹. He is known as the author of the *Tattvaprabodha*.

Haribhadra was a pupil of Jinadeva who was a pupil of Mānadeva of the Brihatgatchha. He was a contemporary of Siddharāja and Kumārapāla. From the frequent references to the ruling princes in his works, it seems that he had some influence at the Court. Most of his works were composed in Anahilavāda. He wrote the *Bandhaśwāmīśva* and a 'tika' on the *Āgamīkavastuvichārasāra* of Jinavallabha, while dwelling in the house of Āsapura in Anahilavāda in V. Samvat 1172 (A. D. 1115-16). He also completed the *Munipati-charitra* consisting of 652 gāthās in Prākṛit in the same year. He is also said to have written the *Śreyānsanāthacharitra*. The work contains 6584 'gāthās' in Prākṛit. It deals with the life of Śreyānsanātha, the eleventh Tīrtban-

78 Arisimha, *Sukritasankīrtana*, p. 30, v. 20. 79 Peterson, III, 18

kara of the Jains and was completed in the reign of Jayasimhadeva. In V Samvat 1185 (A. D. 1128-29), he wrote a *Vivaraṇa* on the *Prasamaratī* of Umasvati in Anahilavada Tradition puts to his credit the biographies of twenty-four Tirthankaras but the *Chandraprabhacaritra* the *Mallinathacaritra* and the *Neminathacaritra* only are available to us. The last work was completed in S. 1216 (A. D. 1159-60) in the reign of Kumarpala. Haribhadra's works give us valuable information about the Jain ministers of Gujarat.⁸⁰

Jineśvara composed the *Mallinathacaritra* in Prakṛita in V S. 1175 (or A. D. 1118-19). The work deals with the life of the nineteenth Tirthankara of the Jains.⁸¹

Vijayasimhasūri was a pupil of Śāntisūri who was a pupil of Nemichandra in the Chandra-gatohha. He was the author of the *Śrāvaka-pratīkramanastotra* in V Samvat 1183 (A. D. 1126-7). The work contains 4500 verses.⁸²

Dharmaghoshasūri was a pupil of Silabhadra-sūri of Rajagatohha. He composed the *Dharma-*

⁸⁰ Gandhi, "Buddhists and Jains" Nos. 40-41. Haribhadra's *Kaśītrāsaṃskṛiti* was completed in Anahilavada in A. D. 1128-29. ⁸¹ Desai, loc. cit., p. 250.
⁸² Peterson, V. 22.

kalpadruma in S 1186 (A. D 1129-30)⁸³ In the same year, Dhavala heard him expound 'parigrahapramāṇa' He was honoured by the King of Śākambhārī, a feudatory of Jayasimha⁸⁴ This Śākambhārī King was Vīgraharāja Viśaladeva III who conferred upon our author the title of Vādichudāmanī In S 1181 (A D 1124-5), the Sūri performed the opening ceremony of a Jain temple in Falodhi⁸⁵ His pupil Yaśobhadrasūri wrote the *Gadyagodāvarī*⁸⁶

Mahendrasūri composed the *Narmadasundarikathā* in V S. 1187 (A D. 1130-31) at the request of his pupil The work describes the mahatmya of Śīla (conduct)⁸⁷

Āmradevasūri, pupil of Jinachandrasūri of Brihadgatchha, wrote the *Ākhyānamanikoshavṛtti* in V S 1190 (A D 1133-4) The work is a commentary on the *Ākhyānamanikoshā* of Nemichandra It was commenced in Yaśonāgaśethavasatī and completed in Dhavalakkapura (Dholakā) Nemichandra, Guṇākara and Pārāva devagani helped him in the work which was completed in about nine months⁸⁸

83 Peterson, V, 107 84 Hiralal Hansraja, Jain History, p 68 85 Peterson, IV, 100 86 Peterson, III, 262 87 *Jesalmere catalogue*, 54. 88 Peterson, III, 78

The *Ākhyana-manikāvalī*⁸⁹ was written in Samvat 1190 (A. D. 1134).

Siddhasūri of the Ukeśagatoḥha was the author of the *Bṛhatkṣhetrasamāsavṛtti* in Samvat 1192 (A. D. 1135-6). He gives the following account of his spiritual descent.—

- (1) Kakkasūri
- |
- (2) Siddhasūri
- |
- (3) Devaguptasūri
- |
- (4) Siddhasūri (Our author)

His guru's brother Yaśodeva helped him to select the subject.⁹⁰

In A. D. 1135-6 the palm-leaf manuscript of the *Pushpāvatīkāvya* was written by Chāmuka in Khetaka (Kaira) when Gangā was a minister of Siddharāja.

Vijayasimhasūri, a pupil of Hemachandra Malladhari completed the *Dharmopadeśamālā* in S. 1191 (A. D. 1135). It contains 14471 verses.

Abhayakumaragani a pupil of Hemachandra

⁸⁹ Peterson III app. p. 81; IV p. XXVIII. ⁹⁰ Peterson III, app. p. 192. ⁹¹ Peterson V p. 111.

Malladhāri, helped Vijayasimhasūri in the composition of his work ⁹¹

Chandrasūri was another well-known pupil of Hemachandrasūri Malladhāri. Before he entered the order of Jain monks, he was the governor of Lāta⁹². At the request of Dhavala, a Porwad Jain of Dholakā, the sūri wrote the *Munisuvratacharita* in Āśavallipuri (Āśawala near Ahmedabad) in V. S 1193 (A. D. 1136)⁹³. It contains 10994 verses. The *Sangrahanīratna* in Prākṛit is another work of Chandrasūri. It is based on the *Sangrahanī* of Jinabhadra Devabhadrāsūri, a pupil of Chandrasūri, wrote a commentary on the *Sangrahanīratna*⁹⁴.

The third work of Chandrasūri Malladhāri is *Kshetrasamāsa*⁹⁵.

Vardhamānasūri, pupil of Govindasūri, wrote the *Gunaratnamahodadhī*, a work on grammar in V. S 1197 (A. D. 1140-41). He was also the author of the *Siddharājavarṇana*⁹⁶.

Kalikālasarvagna Hemasūri was the most learned man of this age and the brightest gem

92 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, 253. 93 Peterson, V 18 (94) Peterson I, 75, Peterson, V 15, Velankar, Nos, 1673, 1681, 1682.) 95 Peterson, III 20. 96 Desai, loc cit. 255

of Siddharaja's court. We shall, therefore study his life in detail.

Hemasūri was born in Dhandhukapura modern Dhandhuka in the Ahmedabad District in V S. 1145 (A D 1088-9) on a full-moon night in Kartika. His father's name was Chachcha and mother's name Pāhini. Before Hemasūri entered the order of Jain monks he was known as Changadeva.

According to the *Kumārāvalambīya* Devasūri once came to Dhandhuka and delivered a stirring sermon. Changadeva being moved by it, begged that he might be taken in the order of monks. When the sūri inquired about his name and parentage his maternal uncle Nemināga stood up and said that he was the son of Chachcha and Chahini. He (Nemināga), moreover requested the sūri to get permission from Chachcha for Changadeva's consecration and persuaded his brother-in-law to consent to the boy's renunciation but Chachcha on account of the

1. The earliest writers Somaprabha and Prabhāchandra say that Chachcha was Hemasūri's father Merulunga, Rājasekhara and Chāritrasundara give the name Chāchhiga Jinamandana sometimes gives the name Chāchhika Somaprabha gives Pāhini instead of Chāhini, as mother's name.

great love he bore to his son, refused his consent. Changadeva, however, with the consent of his maternal uncle, followed the sūri to Cambay and was consecrated in that city²,

Devasūri seems to have seen the boy before and looking to his tendencies, thought that he would be a successful monk, and in order to get him, used Nemināga as his agent

On behalf of the Sūri, Nemināga tried to obtain the consent of Chachcha to Changadeva's consecration, but when he failed, the sūri seems to have taken advantage of Chachcha's absence from home and begged the boy from his mother, as the later chroniclers relate. Fearing that he would lose the boy if he stayed any more in Dhandhukkapura, he went to Stambhatirtha to seek the support of Udayana, an influential member of the community. Chachcha seems to have followed him to Stambhatirtha as he did not like that his son should be consecrated and was persuaded to deliver up the boy through

² Somaprabha, *Kumārapālāpratibodha*, pp 9-10, *Chaturvimsatīprabandha*, p 52, *Prabhāvakacharita*, XXII, 26, 34, *Prabandhachintāmanī* (Tawney's translation), pp 127-9, *Kumārapālāprabandha*, pp 10-11 differ in small details. Their accounts are discussed in the subsequent paragraph

of Siddharāja's court. We shall, therefore study his life in detail.

Hemasūri was born in Dhandhukapura modern Dhandhuka in the Ahmedabad District in V S. 1145 (A D 1088-9) on a full-moon night in Kartika. His father's name was Chachoha and mother's name Pahlini. Before Hemasūri entered the order of Jain monks he was known as Changadeva.

According to the *Kumārāvalambīyapratibodha* Devasūri once came to Dhandhuka and delivered a stirring sermon. Changadeva being moved by it begged that he might be taken in the order of monks. When the sūri inquired about his name and parentage his maternal uncle Neminsaga stood up and said that he was the son of Chachoha and Chahini. He (Neminsaga), moreover requested the sūri to get permission from Chachoha for Changadeva's consecration and persuaded his brother-in-law to consent to the boy's renunciation but Chachoha on account of the

1. The earliest writers Somaprabha and Prabhāchandra say that Chachoha was Hemasūri's father Merutunga Bājasekhara and Chāritrasundara give the name Chāchiga Jinamandana sometimes gives the name Chāchika Somaprabha gives Pāhini instead of Chāhini as mother's name.

great love he bore to his son, refused his consent. Changadeva, however, with the consent of his maternal uncle, followed the sūri to Cambay and was consecrated in that city²,

Devasūri seems to have seen the boy before and looking to his tendencies, thought that he would be a successful monk, and in order to get him, used Nemināga as his agent

On behalf of the Sūri, Nemināga tried to obtain the consent of Chachcha to Changadeva's consecration, but when he failed, the sūri seems to have taken advantage of Chachcha's absence from home and begged the boy from his mother, as the later chroniclers relate. Fearing that he would lose the boy if he stayed any more in Dhandhukkapura, he went to Stambhatīrtha to seek the support of Udayana, an influential member of the community. Chachcha seems to have followed him to Stambhatīrtha as he did not like that his son should be consecrated and was persuaded to deliver up the boy through

2 Somaprabha, *Kumārapālāprabandha*, pp 9-10, *Chaturvimsatīprabandha*, p 52, *Prabhāvakacharita*, XXII, 26, 34, *Prabandhachintāmanī* (Tawney's translation), pp 127-9, *Kumārapālāprabandha*, pp 10-11 differ in small details. Their accounts are discussed in the subsequent paragraph

Udayana's mediations. The Consecration ceremony was then performed in a Jain temple and Chhangadeva received the name Somadeva on consecration according to common practice.

Merutunga and Charitasundara say that the ceremony was performed in Karnavati, but their evidence cannot weigh against that of Somaprabha a contemporary of Hemasūri who says that it was performed in Stambhatirtha and who is closely supported by Prabhachandra. Later on Merutunga also admits that Hemasūri was consecrated in Cambay when he accepts the statement of the *Prabhāvacharita* that Kumārāpala built a dīkshavihāra in Cambay to commemorate Hemasūri's consecration in spite of his previous contradictory statement that the consecration took place in Karnavati.

The *Kumārāpalapratibodha* says nothing about the age of the boy at the time of consecration. According to the *Prabhāvacharita* it was five while according to the *Prabandhakāśikā* the *Prabandhakāśikā* and the *Kumārāpalapratibodha* it was eight. The latter view is acceptable as Jinamandana gives S 1155 or A D 1097-8 as the date of consecration. The dis-

crepancy between the *Prabhāvakashaṛita* and the later accounts is easily explicable. Devachandra-sūri must have come to Dhandhukā in V. S 1150 or A. D 1093-4, when his eyes were first cast on the boy Changadeva, and the latter's formal consent also must have been taken at that time. Considerable time, however, must have elapsed before the necessary permission was obtained from Chachcha. The *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* informs us that Changadeva came with Devasūri to Karnāvatī and was brought up with the sons of Udayana. After the father was appeased and satisfied, he gave his consent to the consecration and performed the festival of initiation.

All these arrangements must have taken about three to four years to be completed. Changadeva must have come under the influence of Devasūri in V. S 1150 or A. D 1093-4 and must have joined the order of Jain monks in V. S 1154 or A. D 1097-8 with the consent of his father.

4 *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, II, p CCLXVIII-IX. From the word "Sivanirmālya" put by Merutunga in the mouth of Chachcha when he was offered money, Mr Rasiklal Parikh infers that Chachcha was a non-Jain. This, however, is not a conclusive proof. Even to-day, many Jains use such words on account of their social relations with the non-Jains. Chachcha is

According to Jain practice Chhangadeva changed his name after consecration and came to be known as Somachandra. He studied Logic and Dialectics as well as grammar and poetics as he was intelligent. When Somachandra had mastered all Sciences Devachandra had the dignity of Acharya conferred on him in S. 1166 or (A. D. 1109-10). Dhanada held a festival on this occasion and spent much wealth. Somachandra again changed his name according to the custom of Jain monks and came to be known as Hemachandrascharya.

We shall now consider how Siddharaja came to be acquainted with Hemachandrasūri. According to the *Prabhavatacharita Kunvarapala Charita* and *Kunvarapalaprabandha* Siddharaja was once riding an elephant through the streets of his capital and saw Hemasūri standing by a shop near a slope. The king stopped his elephant just by the mound and asked the ascetic

called a Mithyētvin. The latter word is many-a-time used for a Jain who does not rigidly follow the rules of his faith by his orthodox co-religionists. We may therefore conclude that Chachabe was not an orthodox Jain as his wife Chāhni was. The latter entered the order of Jain nuns some years after Chhangadeva's consecration.

to recite something. The latter replied immediately in a verse composed on the spur of the moment. The king was so much pleased with the composition that he invited Hemasūri to come to the palace daily at noon to entertain him. Hemasūri accepted the invitation and gradually won the king's favour.⁵

Merutunga knows nothing of this meeting. According to him, when Siddharāja returned to Anahilavāda after his Conquest of Mālwa, Hemachandra and other Jain monks, being invited, went to bless the king. Though all of them were clever, they elected Hemasūri as their representative to pronounce the blessing, and he blessed the king by the following verse.—

“O wishing cow! sprinkle the earth with streams of your product. O sea! make a swastika of pearls. O moon! shine in full splendour. O elephants of the quarters! take leaves of the wishing tree and with your erected trunks make temporary arches of foliage. For truly Siddharāja is coming, having conquered the world.”

When this stanza was explained to the king,

⁵ *Prabhāvakāśharita*, XXII, 64 to 73, Jayasimhasūri, *Kumārapālacharita* I, 274–9, Jinamandana, *Kumārāpālāprabandha*, p. 13

Jayasimha was much pleased at the ingenuity of Hemachandracharya *

Charitrasundara also gives a somewhat similar account. According to him when Siddharaja returned from Malwa men of different sects went to bless the king and seeing that the Jain monks were absent told the king that the Jains had grown haughty and did not even take the trouble of attending the court to bless His Majesty. The Jain ministers told this to Devasūri who consented to go to the court with other monks to bless the king. Coming to the court Hemasūri who was ten (1) years old said "O learned king may you live long! May you delight the world for many years! May you and your servants enjoy health!" The king hearing the blessing inquired as to why they were late. Hemasūri said that the Jain monks had been on state business for three days and had returned only then. The king inquired as to what that business was. Hemasūri said that they had been to invite the wishing cow the sea and the moon to celebrate the triumphal entry and then recited the verse which is the same as that of Merutunga quoted above. The king was much pleased

* Prabodhachintāmaṇi (Tawney's Translation), pp. 87-8

when he heard the verse, and begged from Devasūri that he would perform the Pattābhisheka of Hemasūri⁷

Prabhāchandra, Jayasimhasūri and Jinaman-dana also give a similar account, but relate that Hemachandrasūri only renewed his acquaintance with the king Merutunga, moreover, does not seem to imply that it was the first meeting of Siddharāja and Hemasūri. In his account of the famous debate between Devasūri and Kumudachandra, Merutunga says that Hemasūri was on the side of Devasūri. As the debate took place in V. S 1181 (A D 1125) it is certain that Jayasimha was acquainted with Hemasūri before A D 1125

Several stories are told by the chroniclers about Jayasimha's intercourse with Hemasūri. In a short essay like this, it is not possible to go into their details. They may, yet, be quoted here, in brief, for the sake of completion. The first story told by Prabhāchandra is about a bard who praised Hemachandracharya in an Apabhramśa-verse and received a handsome reward for it⁸

7 Chāritrasundara, *Kumārāpālacharita*, I, (iii), 58 to 74. Chāritrasundara's account, as to the age of Hemasūri when he blessed the king, is unreliable.

8 *Prabhāvakacharita*, XXII, 117-29.

Jayasimha was much pleased at the ingenuity of Hemachandrasahya⁶

Charitrasnndara also gives a somewhat similar account. According to him when Siddharaja returned from Malwa men of different sects went to bless the king and seeing that the Jain monks were absent told the king that the Jains had grown haughty and did not even take the trouble of attending the court to bless His Majesty. The Jain ministers told this to Devasūri who consented to go to the court with other monks to bless the king. Coming to the court Hemasūri who was ten (1) years old said "O learned king may you live long! May you delight the world for many years! May you and your servants enjoy health!" The king hearing the blessing inquired as to why they were late. Hemasūri said that the Jain monks had been on state business for three days and had returned only then. The king inquired as to what that business was. Hemasūri said that they had been to invite the wishing cow the sea and the moon to celebrate the triumphal entry and then recited the verse which is the same as that of Merutunga quoted above. The king was much pleased

⁶ Prabandhaśaṅkṣamāṇi (Tawney's Translation), pp. 87-8

when he heard the verse, and begged from Devasūri that he would perform the Pattābhisheka of Hemasūri⁷

Prabhāchandra, Jayasimhasūri and Jinaman-dana also give a similar account, but relate that Hemachandrasūri only renewed his acquaintance with the king Merutunga, moreover, does not seem to imply that it was the first meeting of Siddharāja and Hemasūri. In his account of the famous debate between Devasūri and Kumuda-chandra, Merutunga says that Hemasūri was on the side of Devasūri. As the debate took place in V. S 1181 (A. D. 1125) it is certain that Jayasimha was acquainted with Hemasūri before A. D. 1125.

Several stories are told by the chroniclers about Jayasimha's intercourse with Hemasūri. In a short essay like this, it is not possible to go into their details. They may, yet, be quoted here, in brief, for the sake of completion. The first story told by Prabhāchandra is about a bard who praised Hemachandracharya in an Apabhramśa-verse and received a handsome reward for it.⁸

7 Chāritrasundara, *Kumārāpālacharita*, I, (11), 58 to 74. Chāritrasundara's account, as to the age of Hemasūri when he blessed the king, is unreliable.

8 *Prabhāvalacharita*, XXII, 117-29.

The second story in the *Prabdhātacharita* is about Rāmachandra a prominent pupil of Hemachandra. It contains the historical fact that Rāmachandra had only one eye. The third story told by Prabhāchandra shows how Hemasūri by his skill and knowledge silenced the envious Brahmins who tried to poison the ears of the king against the Jains.⁹ The fourth story in the *Prabdhātacharita* deals with Viniga who probably served Kumārāpala. The fifth story deals with the ascetic Devabodha who pleased Hemasūri with a verse composed in his honour. The eūri thereupon procured a large sum of money for Devabodha from the king.¹⁰

This story is not mentioned elsewhere. On the other hand, Jīnamandanaṅgaṇi and Cāritrasundaraṅgaṇi mention one Devabodha as Hemasūri's rival in the account of Kumārāpala's conversion. According to the fifth story told by Prabhāchandra and Jayasimhasūri Siddharāja made a pilgrimage to Somanatha and other holy places in the company of Hemasūri. The sixth story in the *Prabdhātacharita* is about the composition of the Siddha Hema. Once when the officers were showing the king books from the library of

⁹ Ibid, XXII, 123-29 ¹⁰ Ibid, XXII, 140-72. ¹¹ Ibid, XXII, 184-81.

Avanti, Jayasimha's eyes fell upon the 'lakshana pustaka,' a book on grammar. The king asked what it was. Hemasūri answered that it was the *Bhojavyākaraṇa*, the prevalent Grammar of the language, compiled by the Paramāra king Bhoja who was also the author of the works on Sabdaśāstra, Alankāraśāstra and Tarkaśāstra. This aroused Jayasimha's jealousy. He expressed his regret that his treasury contained no similar series of manuals written in his kingdom. Thereupon, all the assembled scholars looked at Hemachandra, thereby indicating that they considered him worthy of becoming Bhoja of Mālwa. The king agreed with them and requested Hemachandrasūri to compile a new grammar as those available did not serve their purpose. Hemasūri expressed his willingness to fulfil the king's desire but begged his aid. The king, then, procured for him eight older grammars from various places, and Hemasūri set himself to the task and finished it within two or three years. When it was recited at the court, it was accepted as criterion by the learned. The king employed 300 Copyists to make copies of the grammar for three years and gave one copy to each of the chiefs of all sects in his kingdom. Moreover, he sent copies throughout India, and appointed a very learned grammarian named Kakala to teach

it in Anahilavada. Every month a public examination of his pupils was held on the fifth day of the bright half and whoever came out successful received a shawl a golden ornament, a sedan chair or sun-shade from the king¹²

Prabhachandra's account about the composition of the Siddha-Hema is confirmed by Hemasūri himself who says that the grammar was compiled by him at the request of Jayasimbhadeva¹³ Merutunga adds that the grammar was placed on an elephant and taken in procession in Anahilavada

The Siddha Hema contains eight adhyayas and thirty-two padas and at the end of the commentary of each pada there is one verse in honour of one of the Chaulukya kings from Mularaja to Siddharaja whereas at the end of the whole there are four verses.¹⁴

Merutunga gives three more stories two of which show Hemachandra's erudition The third story of Merutunga tells us how Hemasūri pleased the king by telling him that all religions

12. *Prabhavakavirita* XXII 74-115. 13. Jain Yuga, II p. 162 14 It is not possible to discuss this grammar in detail in this place. Mr. B. U. Doshi has thoroughly discussed this work in an article in the *Purdattva*, IV pp. 60 to 100

if sincerely practised, lead to salvation. It also throws light on the religious and ethical influence that Hemasūri exercised on Jayasimha.

To the stories of Prabhāchandra and Merutunga, Jinamandana adds two more. According to the first story, when the king expressed his desire to listen to a sermon, Hemasūri recommended to the king the common duties acceptable to all. According to the second story, Hemasūri taught the king, when the latter had the temple of Śiva and Mahāvira built in Siddhapura, that the Tirthankara was superior to Śiva.

The stories, quoted above, are quite right as to the manner in which Hemasūri behaved towards the king. Hemasūri would have been invited to the court during the last few years of Jayasimha's reign. Undoubtedly, he would have endeavoured to shine out by his learning and smartness and he would have let no opportunity pass of saying a good word for his sect or for the equal rights of the non-Brahmin sects. At the same time, he will have taken care to emphasize those points in which the Jain doctrine coincides with Brahmanism.

Hemasūri was also a contemporary of the Chaulukya king Kumārapāla. We shall study his relations to Kumārapāla hereafter.

Upto this time we have dealt with the activities of the Jain ministers Jain officers and Jain monks and nuns of the time of Siddharaja. There were, however many Jain laymen who did useful work by spending money freely for the spread of knowledge. The *Jain-pustakaprasastisangraha* compiled by Muni Jinavijaya gives names of many Śrāvakas and Śrāvikas who gave away large sums of money for writing books. But most of the Prasastis give very little information about the donors. There are however some big prasastis in the work. The Prasasti to the *Bhagavatsutra* is one of them.¹ It contains valuable information about the family of a Jain layman named Siddha.

Siddhinaga the great grand-father of Siddha, had four sons named Vodbaka (or Podhaka), Virada, Vaduka (or Vardhana) and Dranaka. The sons of Siddhinaga had performed many pious and religious deeds and set up the images of Tirthankaras.

Of Siddhinaga's sons Virada had great respect for Jain monks. His wife Dhanadevi was a staunch Jain. Varadeva Virada's son was a kind and excellent follower of Jina. He set up an

¹ Jinavijaya, *Jain Pustakaprasastisangraha*, No. 8.

image of Mahavira and spent money liberally for writing the *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra-vṛtti*

Varadeva had a son named Siddha and six daughters named Champushri, Amritadevi, Jinamati, Yasoragi, Pagu and Ambā

Siddha, son of Varadeva and Lakshmī, had two wives named Rājamati and Shriyadevī. When Varadeva was on death-bed, he asked his son Siddha to spend money for the spread of spiritual knowledge. Siddha respected the wishes of his dying father by spending money in making the copies of the following ten books containing about one lakh verses —

(1) *Suyagadanga sūta*, *Nijjuttā*, *Vittā*. (2) *Uvasagadashā*, *Angasutta*, *Vittā*. (3) *Ovāyasutta*, *Vittā*, *Rāyappasenīya Sutta*. (4) *Kappasutta*, *Bhāsa*. (5) *Kappachunnī*. (6) *Dasaveyāliyasutta*, *Nijjuttā*, *Vittā*. (7) *Uvaesamala*. (8) *Bhavabhāvanā*. (9) *Panchasagasutta*, *Vittā*. (10) *Pindavisuddhi*, *Vittā* & *Padhamapanchasaga Chūnī*, *Laghuvira-charīya*, *Rayanachudakaha*

At the time of her death, Rājamati, Siddha's wife, had requested her husband to spend money after her in writing the *Bhagavatisūtra* and its commentary. Her wishes were fulfilled by her

husband The commentary on the *Bhagavatsutra* was written in Anshilavāda in V S. 1187 when Siddharāja was the ruler and was presented to Chakresvarasūri a pupil of Vardhamanasūri, who was a pupil of Salibhadrasūri.¹

We shall now consider which religion Siddharāja professed Although it would be too bold to assert that he was a staunch Jain yet it would not be untrue to say that he had some inclination towards Jainism. Firstly, the Arab Geographer Al Idrasi says that Jayasimha used to worship a Buddha image" Secondly he was trained by his Jain ministers Santa, Munjala and Udayana. Thirdly Abhayadevasūri Malladhari, Kalikalesarvagna Hemachandrasūri Hemachandrasūri Malladhari Viracharya and other Jain monks were his friends He listened to their sermons with great pleasure On the advice of Abhayadevasūri he stopped the taking of life for eight days of the Pajusanaparva. At the suggestion of the same monk, he adorned Jain temples with staffs and gold knobs and restored their grants which were withheld by his wicked non-Jain officers. Fourthly he built a temple to Mahavirawami in Siddhapura, and another to Parśvanatha

¹ Jinavijaya Ibid, No. 2.

in Anahilavāda, when the Svetāmbara doctor Devasūri won a victory over the Digambara Kumudaachandra. He is also said to have sanctioned much money for the stone temple which his governor Sajjana erected on Giranāra. Fifthly, he made pilgrimages to Giranāra and Śatrunjaya and made a grant of twelve villages to the temple of Ādinatha.⁹⁸

98 Attempts have been made to show that Siddharāja was not favourably inclined to Jainism, and the story of Merutunga that the king did not allow the Jains to hoist flags on their temples for some time, quoted. The story of Merutunga, unconfirmed as it is, does not deserve credence. It is hardly probable that a king who allowed the Musalmans to erect a mosque in Stambhatīrtha and took particular care to see that their religious liberty was not invaded, should refuse permission to the Jains to hoist flags.

Chapter II

Kumārāpāla



Bhīmādeva I was the great-grandfather of Kumārāpāla. He had a son named Kshemarāja or Harapāla who had married Sūta a daughter of the king of Marudeśa. Kshemarāja a lover of art and religion had a son named Devaprastā who was a great donor. The latter had a son named Tribhuvānapāla who had three sons—Mahipāla Kirtipāla and Kumārāpāla and two daughters Premaladevi and Devaladevi.

1 Ojha *Rajpala-naka Itihāsa* I p. 218, l. 3; *Dvyū-
raya*, IX 70-2.

According to the barda Śiddharāja had a son see. Their evidence however cannot weigh against that of the *Dvyūraya* (XV 85) which clearly says that Śiddharāja had no son.

According to Ted Kumārāpāla originally belonged to the Chohēne race and adopted the family name

The accounts of the later chroniclers clearly bring out the fact that Kumārapāla had become a foot-ball of fortune before he came to the throne. The same is confirmed by contemporary evidence. The *Kumārapālapratibodha* says that Kumārapāla, thinking one day that he must practise dharma as he had come to the throne after passing through many vicissitudes of life, told his minister his desire to know real religion.² We, moreover, find a reference to his wanderings in a verse in the *Moharājaparājaya* which says, "To whom is this prince of the Gurjaras, the banner of the Chaulukya race not known, who through curiosity wandered alone through the whole world".³ Hemasūri's silence on this

Chālukya after his accession to the throne of Anahilavāda (*Western India*, p 141) Uncorroborated as Tod's statement is, we shall have to reject it in the light of the evidence of Hemasūri who traces his descent from Bhimadeva. Hemasūri's statement is confirmed by a Chitoda inscription of the reign of Kumārapāla.

According to Merutunga, Kumārapāla's great grandmother was a courtesan, but the statement is not confirmed by other evidence.

2 Somaprabha, *Kumārapālapratibodha*, P 5

3 *Moharājaparājaya*, I, 28, Kielhorn, Report (1880-81), p 34

Chapter II

Kumārāpāla.



Bhūmadeva I was the great-grandfather of Kumārāpāla. He had a son named Kāshemarāja or Harapāla who had married Sutarā, a daughter of the king of Marudeśa. Kāshemarāja, a lover of art and religion had a son named Devaprasād who was a great donor. The latter had a son named Tribhuvanapāla who had three sons—Mahipāla Kirtipāla and Kumārāpāla and two daughters Premaladevī and Devaladevī.

1. Ojha, *Rajasthanaka Itihāsa* I, p. 218, l. 2; *Dvyāranya*, IX 70-2.

According to the barda Siddharāja had seven sons. Their evidence however cannot weigh against that of the *Dvyāranya* (XV 55) which clearly says that Siddharāja had no son.

According to Ted, Kumārāpāla originally belonged to the Chokkna race and adopted the family name

That Kumārapāla wandered away from home to avoid death at the hands of Siddharāja is a well-known fact; so when he heard about Siddharāja's death, he hurried to Anahilavāṇa and saw his brother-in-law Kanhadādeva who helped him to the throne in S 1199 or A. D. 1143. According to the *Prabandhachintānāṁ*, he was fifty years old when he was crowned king.

On coming to the throne, Kumārapāla generously rewarded those who had helped him in his days of adversity. He made Vagohata, Udayana's son, his minister and gave the paragana of Chitrakuta with seven hundred villages to Alinga, the potter. Vosiri his friend, received Lata deśa. Bhima and other cultivators were made body guards, and Bhopaladeri was made the chief queen.⁵

As Kumārapāla came to the throne at a ripe age when he had gained enough experience of the world by wandering in many countries, he was practically independent of his ministers. But as the latter did not like this, they formed a plot to slay him. Kumārapāla, having received information from a friend, avoided the gate

⁵ Jayasimhasūri, *Kumārapālaskhāṭa*, III, 524, 521, 474; *Kumārapālaprabandha*, p. 34.

point has no significance as he could not have chid Kumarapala for leading a beggarly life before coming to the throne

Among the persons who had shirked Kumarapala in adversity there were probably Alinga the potter Bhumasimha the cultivator, Vosiri his friend, Udayana Vagbhata and Hemasūri. It is difficult to be sure about the places visited by him, especially as the later chroniclers add many more. But they are unanimous in saying that he had visited Cambay Baroda Broach, Kolambapattana and Ujjain. It need not however be supposed that these were the only places he visited. In those days when travelling was difficult, he must have halted at many places. The story of the miserly rat⁴ occurs in the accounts of all the chroniclers and Rajsekhar who does not say anything about the king's early career also knows it, as he credits him with having built a Mushikavihara out of repentance for causing the death of the mouse. The statement that he paid a visit to the shrine of Śiva in Ujjain and read the verse referring to him is probably historical as it is known to all the chroniclers and the verse is preserved in their works in the same version

⁴ Prabandāśaśanamālā, p. p. 103-5

When Kumārapāla received this news, he sent Kāka against Ballāla and himself led an army against Anna. On the way, he was joined by king Vikramasimha of Abu. In the battle that followed, Anna was defeated. He acknowledged Kumārapāla as his overlord and gave his daughter Jalhana in marriage to the king⁹

This victory of Kumārapāla over the Sapādalaksha king is certainly historical, as it is confirmed by the Chaulukya copperplates as well as by Someśvara, Arisimha, Bālachandrasūri, Udayaprabhasūri and other chroniclers¹⁰

Like Kumārapāla, his general Kāka who was sent against Ballāla of Avantī, was also successful. Ballāla had bought off the king's sāmants—Vijaya and Krishna. At first, the imperial forces fled before the furious charge made by Ballāla but the Brahmin senapati Kāka brought them under the banner of Anahilavāda by his stirring address. The Gujarata army then fought with

9 *Dvyāśraya*, XVI, 24 to XIX, 60

10 Ind. Ant., VI, 194; Ibid, VI, 146, Vadanagara-prasasti, v. 9; Someśvara, *Kirtikaumudī*, II, 46, Arisimha, *Sukritasankirtana*, II, 43; Bālachandra, *Vasantavilas*, III, 29, Udayaprabha, *Sukritakirtikalolnī*, V, 61

where the assassins were posted and seeing the intriguers put them to death.⁶

As the king's brother-in-law had helped him to the throne he became very haughty and cut Jokes at him in the presence of others. When Kumārapāla's warnings fell on deaf ears the king put out his eyes.⁷ This exemplary punishment had its desired effects and from that day all other nobles feared the king and did not disobey his commands.⁸

Kumārapāla spent the next few years of his reign in consolidating his kingdom and in conquering new territories. Accordig to the *Dvyākṛaya Anna*, king of *Sapādalakṣha* hearing of *Jaya* *śimha*'s death thought that the government of Gujarat had become weak and planned an invasion of that country. He formed a confederacy against Kumārapāla. It was arranged that *Ballala* king of *Avanti* and *Anna* of *Sapādalakṣha* with other members of the confederacy should simultaneously attack Gujarat.

6. Merutunga, *Prabandhachintāmaṇi*, p. 196; *Kumārapālaprabandha*, p. 34

7. Meratunga, *Ibid* p. 196; *Jayaśimha, Kumārapāla-āṣṭakā*, III, 492-513

8. Chāritrānandana, *Kumārapāla-āṣṭakā*, III, (ii) 10-11.

When Kumārapāla received this news, he sent Kāka against Ballāla and himself led an army against Anna. On the way, he was joined by king Vikramasimha of Abu. In the battle that followed, Anna was defeated. He acknowledged Kumārapāla as his overlord and gave his daughter Jalhanā in marriage to the king.⁹

This victory of Kumārapāla over the Sapadalaksha king is certainly historical, as it is confirmed by the Chaulukya copperplates as well as by Someśvara, Arisimha, Balachandrasūri, Udayaprabhasūri and other chroniclers.¹⁰

Like Kumārapāla, his general Kāka who was sent against Ballāla of Avantī, was also successful. Ballāla had bought off the king's samants—Vijaya and Krishna. At first, the imperial forces fled before the furious charge made by Ballāla but the Brahmin senapati Kāka brought them under the banner of Anahilavāda by his stirring address. The Gujarata army then fought with

9 *Dvyāśraya*, XVI, 24 to XIX, 60

10 Ind. Ant., VI, 194, *Ibid*, VI, 146, *Vadanagara-prasasti*, v. 9, Someśvara, *KīrtiKaumudī*, II, 46, Arisimha, *Sukritasankīrtana*, II, 43, Bālachandra, *Vasantavilas*, III, 29; Udayaprabha, *Sukritakīrti-kallolīni*, V. 61

great enthusiasm and put the Malava soldiers to flight. Five kings fell Ballala on the ground in the presence of Kaka and before the latter could prevent them some wicked Brahmins put him to death.¹¹ According to Mt Abu inscription of Bhima II dated V S 1287 (A. D. 1230-1), Paramara Yajodhavala a king of Abu and feud story of Kumārapāla, was one of the kings who fell Ballala on the ground.¹²

This victory of Kumārapāla's general over Ballala is certainly historical, as it is confirmed by contemporary evidence as well as by chroniclers like Somāvara and Balachandrasuri.¹³

11 *Dvyātraya*, XIX 94-120. Mr Forbes, here makes a mistake. He says that Kumārapāla personally went against Ballala and defeated him. (*Rasikala* I, 150). The same mistake is repeated in the *Ind. Ant.* IV 268.

12 *Historical Inscriptions of Gujarat* II No. 167. According to the *Dvyātraya* the king of Ābu who fought on the side of Kumārapāla was Vikramasimha. We do not find this name in the inscription mentioned above. It seems therefore that Vikramasimha was on the throne for a short time, and as Prabhāchandra-suri says was deposed by Kumārapāla for acting against his interests. The same authority informs us that Kumārapāla gave the throne to Yajodhavala, Vikramasimha's nephew (*Prabhāchandraśekhara*, XXII, 574).

13 *Vadanagara Prasth* of the reign of Kumāra-

It is difficult to say who this Ballala was. We also do not know how he became the king of Mālwa. He was probably one of the rebels who took advantage of anarchy in Mālwa after Yaśovarman's death and seized the reins of Government. Mr D. K. Shastri fancies that Ballala who was killed by Kumārāpāla's general was the Hoysala king Ballala of Dwārasamudra who lived between V. S. 1229 and 1268 (A. D. 1173 and 1212), but it seems to be a mistake,¹⁴ because the victory over Ballala was won before V. S. 1208 or A. D. 1151-2 and contemporary evidence clearly proves that Ballala was killed in the battle.

It seems, however, equally probable that Ballaladeva may be another name for Jayavarman, successor of Yaśovarman because the Vadanagara Prasasti takes credit for destroying him.¹⁵

Other evidence shows that Anna and Ballala were defeated before V. S. 1207 and 1208 respectively.^{15A}

pala (G. I, VIII, p. 221), *Kirtikaumudr*, II, 48, *Vasanta Vilasa*, III, 29.

14 *Gujaratano Madhyakalina Rajputa Itihasa*, II, p. 210. 15 E. I, VIII, p. 211.

15A *Bharatake Prashna Rajavamsa*, I, p. 242; Vadanagara Prasasti.

The chroniclers record another successful expedition of Kumarapala against Mallikarjuna. According to Merutunga a bard once sang the praises of Mallikarjuna in the Court of Kumarapala and called him *Rajapitamaha* or the grandfather of Kings. The king becoming very angry on hearing the high praises bestowed on the king of Konkana looked at his samants. A minister named Ambada son of the famous Udayana reading his mind stood before him with hands folded and requested the King to give him orders to march against the proud king of Konkana. King Kumarapala being much pleased with him gave him the command of an army that marched against Mallikarjuna. By a series of marches Ambada reached Konkana and crossing the river Kalavini (probably Kaveri flowing by Valasada and Ohikhali) that was in flood encamped on its bank. Hearing of his arrival King Mallikarjuna came with an army to meet him. In the battle that followed the Gujarata army was put to flight and Ambada was forced to return to Anahilavada. Being ashamed of his defeat, he pitched a black tent, and putting on black clothes and adorning his crest with a black umbrella lived outside the city. Kumarapala once seeing the black tent, asked his men whose on

campment it was, and coming to know that it was Āmbada's, called him to his presence and sent him for the second time against Mallikārjuna with a large army. This time Āmbada's efforts were crowned with success. Mallikārjuna was defeated and killed and Āmbada returned to Anahilavāda with large booty¹⁶

The credit of defeating Mallikārjuna given to Āmbada by the Jain chroniclers is not undisputed. Jayānaka in the *Prithvirājavyaya* gives this credit to Someśvara, son of Arnoraja, by his wife Kanchanadevi of Gujarat¹⁷. In an inscription in Tejhpala's temple on Mt. Ābu, Dharāvārsha,

16 *Prabandhaśhīntāmanī*, p. 203; *Chāritrasundara-Kumārāpālācharita* III, (111), 1-56

17 *Prithvirājavyaya*, VII, 15. Jayasīma was the maternal grand-father of Someśvara. Hearing from the astrologers that he would be an incarnation of Rāma to perform certain duties, Siddharāja took him to his court. His successor Kumārāpāla brought up the child and thus made his name significant. He received the name Pratāpalankeśvara, and married Karpuradevi, daughter of the Kalachuri king of Tripuri. He built five temples at Ajmere and several others in a village Ganganaka. He founded a town and named it after his father. His inscriptions dated V S 1226, 1228, 1229, 1230 and 1234 show him to be a contemporary of

the Paramara king of Ābu, is said to have made the wives of the king of Konkana weep" This Dhāravarsha was a feudatory of Kumarapala and seems to have accompanied Āmbada in his expedition against Mallikarjuna.

Other evidence shows that Āmbada was the Governor of Lata deśa. It seems therefore that Āmbada was given the command of an army sent against Mallikarjuna and Dhāravarsha and Someśvara accompanied him. In the decisive battle that was fought against Mallikarjuna Someśvara and Dhāravarsha seem to have performed prodigies of valour and that is why Jayanaka and Someśvara (author of the Prasasti in Tejahpala's temple) give credit of defeating Mallikarjuna to Someśvara son of Arnoraja and Dhāravarsha respectively. The chroniclers give the credit of defeating Mallikarjuna to Āmbada because he was the commander of the army.

This Mallikarjuna was the Silhara King of Thāna. He was the son of Harapala Silhara.

Kumarapala and Ajayapala. Someśvara gave the village of Revana to Parśvanatha. When he died, his son was a minor (Journal, Bengal Asiatic Society N B XXV p. 198).

18. *Prachīna Loka* No 63 *Gujarato Mahāyāgāna*
Itihāsa II, p. 296

His two inscriptions dated A. D. 1126 and 1160 show him to be a contemporary of Kumārapāla¹⁹ He held sway over Thānā and Colābā Districts He was a weakling and that is the reason why the Chaulukya Copperplates do not take notice of his defeat

This Victory of Kumārapāla is certainly historical as it is confirmed by his contemporary Hemasūri as well as by Someśvara, Arisimha, Udayaprabhasūri, Jayasimhasūri and Bālachandra²⁰

Merutunga records another expedition of Kumārapāla against Sumvar of Kāthiawāda. Udayana was given command of army against Sumvar, but he received mortal wounds and died²¹ Alhanadeva Chohāna of Nadula defeated the rebels in Saurāstra according to the wishes of Kumārapāla.²²

19 Bom Gaz, I, (1), 196, Moraes, *Kadamba Kula*, 156. Mr Moraes thinks that he succeeded in ousting the Hoysalas from Haugal and Bānavāsī for the time being 20 Hemasūri, *Kumārapāla charita*, II, 49, Arisimha, *Sukritasankirtana*, II, 43, Udayaprabhasūri, *Sukritakirtikallolam*, V. 65, Vastupāla-Tejahpāla Prasasti-V 26, Bālachandra, *Vasanta Vēlāsa*, III, 29 21. *Prabandhachintāmanī*, p 217 22, E. I., IX 68. 23. *Prabandhachintāmanī*, p 217.

Merutunga says that Udayana had taken a vow to build a stone temple on the Satrunjaya Hill, when he was sent against the rebel chief in Saurashtra. As the temple was built in V. S. 1211 or 1213 by Vagbhata's expedition against the rebel chief was certainly sent before V. S. 1211 (or A. D. 1154-5).

Merutunga and Jinamandana record a second contest with the Sapadalaksha king (who must be either Ana's son Jesangadeva or his grandson Ano). According to Jinamandana, the cause of the war was the refusal of the Sapadalaksha king to send Uttarāsana (or a piece of cloth used by the Jains at the time of worshipping an image of a Tirthankara). It is difficult to be sure of the cause given by Jinamandanagani. It is probable however that non-payment of the tribute by the Sapadalaksha king may have led to war with that king²².

Ohāhada was given command of the army

22 In an inscription of Somesvara dated V. S. 1236 it is recorded that Vīgraharāja IV invaded Nadula and burnt Jabalipura of Ālhanadeva a Samant of Kumārapāla. This may have been one of the causes of the second expedition against the Sapadalaksha king (Journal, Bengal Asiatic Society V 55 p. 41).

sent against the king After a few marches, he reached Bamberā and invested the ramparts of the city with 2800 soldiers Hearing from the people of the town that on the very night of his arrival the marriage ceremonies of seven hundred maidens had begun, he suspended operations during that night and in the morning stormed and took the fort where he found much gold. Establishing the authority of Kumārapāla in the country and appointing new officers, Chāhada returned to Anahilavada with 700 weavers, many men and much gold Kumārapāla appreciated Chāhada's services and gave him the title of 'Rājagharatta' or the king's whet stone.²⁴

Up to this time, Kumārapāla was engaged in conquering new countries and in consolidating his empire and had no time to think of religion When this work was almost over, he desired to know the truth about religion; so his minister Vagbhata requested him to receive instructions from Hemasūri²⁵ The king accepted the advice

24 Jinamandana, *Kumārapālaprabandha*, p 76 Merutunga knows of this title but he does not say that Chāhada became Rājagharatta' after his triumphal return from Bamberā

(25) Somaprabha, *Kumārapālapratibodha*, pp 5-6.

of his minister and paid daily visits to the monk who explained to him the necessity of abstaining from flesh and preventing the taking of life

This need not lead us to believe that Hemachandra and Kumārapāla first met after the work of conquest was over

From certain verses in the Mahāvīracarita of Hemasūri, Dr. Bühler comes to the conclusion that Kumārapāla's acquaintance with Hemasūri began according to the verse 53 in the time when the empire had achieved its greatest expansion and when the war expeditions and conquests were over (Bühler-Hemachandra p. 34). It seems, however that "the learned doctor draws a conclusion from the verses based upon an implication which they do not carry"; for the order of narration of events does not necessarily imply their chronological order and when we study the verses carefully we find that no such sequence is intended.

Another argument of Dr Bühler that the Prabandhas though mention early acquaintance do not describe the relationship of Hemachandra and Kumārapāla immediately after the latter became king, does not bear examination for various reasons. Firstly we cannot infer anything from the absence of mention, and secondly Kumārapāla in the beginning of his reign was too busy subduing his internal and external enemies and consolidating and extending his Empire to think of religious meetings with Hemachandra.

Hemasūri's sermon had its desired effects. Kumārapāla made up his mind to refrain from killing, flesh-eating and hunting till the end of his

(*Kāvyaṇuśāsaṇa*, II, p.p. CCLXXXIII-IV) The utmost that can be said in favour of Dr Buhler's view is that Hemasūri and Kumārapāla's intimate contact must have begun after the greatest expansion of his empire, and Kumārapāla must have found time for "doing honour daily to that monk" after war expeditions and conquests were over. The question arises as to when Kumārapāla and Hemachandra first met. According to Jinamandanaganī, Kumārapāla once went to Pattana to wait upon Jayasimha and saw Hemāchārya seated on a lion-seat before the king. He felt that as the learned Jain monk was being respected by the king, it would be a meritorious thing to meet him, so he went to the lecture-hall of Hemasūri and asked him what the best virtue was. Hemachandra asked him to behave as a brother towards the wives of others. *Kumārapālaprabandha*, pp 18-22

There is nothing improbable or incredible in the account of Jinamandana. Kumārapāla must have been attending the court of Jayasimha to wait upon the king before he came to know of the evil intention of Siddharāja, and as Hemasūri attended Jayasimha's court frequently, Kumārapāla must have seen him. Moreover, as Hemāchārya was much respected by Jayasimha, Kumārapāla must have thought it advisable to see him.

days and forbade the taking of life throughout the kingdom. The offerings of living animals to gods were also stopped."

That Kumārapāla realising like Akbar under Jain influence that it is not meet that man should make his stomach the grave of animals forbade the destruction of life in his kingdom, is proved by other evidence also. According to the Dvyas rayn king Kumārapāla seeing a man taking four or five half-dead goats to a butcher felt much that the people in his kingdom killed beasts and so forbade the taking of life in his kingdom. Animal sacrifices were stopped. As the result of this edict the ascetics in Pālī land (Marwad) did not get the skin of the deer to use as a covering and the people of Panchaladeśa though formerly great destroyers of life were prevented from taking life

We, therefore, come to the conclusion that Kumārapāla and Hemachandra must have met in the reign of Jayasimha before Kumārapāla was forced to wander to save his life.

The Prabandhas relate that Hemasūri had helped Kumārapāla in his days of adversity and forecast that he would be a king of Gujarat.

(26) Somaprabha, Kumārapālopratikāśha, p. p. 40-41.

The *Mahāvracharita* adds that pigeon racing and cock-fighting were stopped Kumārapāla insisted upon the care of all living creatures, whether they lived in water, on the land or in the air. Even a man of the lowest birth was not allowed to kill bugs, lice and the like ²⁷

27 *Mahāvracharita*, XII, 65-74 It is a mistake to suppose that injury to living creatures was forbidden for certain days in the year Mr Shastri D K quotes the Kiradu inscription in which Ālhanadeva had forbidden injury to living creatures for six days in a month The inscription bears the date S 1209, so its evidence cannot be used to decide for how many days injury to living beings was forbidden, because Kumārapāla's contemporary Yaśahpāla clearly states that injury to living creatures was forbidden for a period of twelve years (14 years according to Merutunga) Thus from the *Moharājaparājaya* it is clear that injury to living creatures was forbidden in V S 1216 It is, therefore, a mistake to expect a reference to an event that had occurred in V S 1216 in an inscription of V S 1209

On the other hand, it is quite probable, as the Kiradu inscription of V S. 1209 says that injury to living creatures was forbidden for a few days in a month, in the beginning, and by V S 1216, complete injury to living beings was forbidden throughout the year.

From the *Maharājapardjaya*, it is clear that injury to living creatures was forbidden in V. S. 1216 (or A. D. 1160)

Though Kumarpala proclaimed *amāri* he did not wish that butchers and others who made a living by taking life or killing creatures should suffer so he generously compensated the butchers by giving them three years income²⁸

The later chroniclers also relate that Kumarpala proclaimed *amāri* for a period of fourteen years. They further state that this edict was strictly enforced. The story is told of a merchant of Sapadalakshadēśa who was compelled to build the Yukavihar for killing a louse²⁹ The *Mahāvīracharita* (XII, v. 66) seems to confirm this story

Hemasūri then impressed upon the king the necessity of abandoning gambling by enumerating its numerous vices and telling him the story of Nala.³⁰ At its end, Kumarpala asked the sūri whether he could play at dice for the sake of pleasure but when the sūri replied in the negative the king took a vow to refrain from

²⁸ *Dvayātraya*, IX. 4 to 37. ²⁹ *Prabandhaśāhī*—*monā*, p. 232. ³⁰ *Bemaprabha*, *Kumārpalapratibodha*, p. 47

the same At his minister's request, Kumārapāla issued edicts declaring gambling illegal in his kingdom³¹ The above account of Somaprabhasūri is confirmed by the *Mahāvīracharita* (XII, v. 73).

Hemasūri then, dwelt at great length upon the necessity of behaving as a brother to the wives of others and told the king the story of Pradyota At its end, Kumārapāla told the sūri that he was always averse to the wives of others, and never tolerated any one in his kingdom who thought of them³²

The Sūri, then, advised the king to give up the company of courtezans and drinking. Kumārapāla accepted the sūri's advice and enforced prohibition in his kingdom³³ This account of Kumārapāla's contemporary is confirmed by the *Mahāvīracharita*³⁴ and the *Dvyās'raya* The latter work adds that the king generously compensated those who had suffered by his edict by giving them three years' income.³⁵

At the sūri's desire, the king next gave up the practice of confiscating the property of a man

31 Somaprabha, *Ibid*, p p 76-7 32 *Ibid*, p 84.

33 *Ibid*, p. 92. 34 *Ibid*, *Mahāvīracharita*, XII, 70-1

dying without leaving a child.³⁶ This account is confirmed by the *Dvyāśraya*, the *Mahāvīracarita* and the *Kirtikāsmudrā*.³⁷

Like a skilful missionary Hemasūri had at first not insisted upon the more particular doctrines of Jainism but had confined his attention to the teaching of the common principles of Hinduism and Jainism. When, however he scored victory in his work he proceeded to instruct the king in the particular doctrines of his faith. He told the king that Arhat' was omnipotent omniscient and free from internal enemies and should, therefore be worshipped in eight different ways.³⁸

After explaining devatattva to the king Hemasūri proceeded to explain Dharma-tattva and gurutattva. He told Kumārapāla that there were four main forms of Dharma-tattva - Dana (generosity) Śīla (good conduct) Tapa (penance) and Bhāvana (good intention) and dwelt at great length upon the three sub-divisions of

36 Somaprabha, *Kumārapālapratibodhā*, p. 114.

37 *Dvyāśraya* XX 36-38 *Kirtikāsmudrā*, II, 43; *Mahāvīracarita*, XII 14.

38 Somaprabha, *Kumārapālapratibodhā* pp 117
122 123-30.

dana—jñānadana (or imparting knowledge to others), 'abhayadana' (saving the lives of others) and dharmopastambhadana which consisted in giving food, drink, clothing, beds, seats and other accommodations to the Jains. Thereupon the king opened a satrāgara for the Jains and appointed Abhayakumāra, son of Nemināga, as its superintendent.³⁹

Hemasūri next proceeded to explain the king the twelve vows of a Jain layman. As to the practical results which followed the taking of the first vow, Jinamandana says that besides forbidding the destruction of life in his eighteen provinces, Kumārāpala persuaded the princes of fourteen states to pass similar edicts in their kingdoms. Moreover, he declared the use of unstrained water illegal, and like Śilāditya of Mōlapo, gave strained water to his horses and elephants. Hemasūri then gave him the biruda of 'Śaranāgatatrāta'.⁴⁰

After taking the second vow, Kumārāpala spoke sweet, truthful and measured words. His dealings with friends, wives, enemies and preceptors were marked with straight forwardness

39 Ibid, p. p 219-20

40 *Kumārāpālāprabandha*, p 81

If he told a lie unconsciously he performed penance out of repentance for the same⁴¹

When Kumarapala took the fourth vow all his queens except Bhopaladevi had died later on, when the last queen died, the king refused to marry another, even though persuaded by his men to do so.⁴²

Realising that contentment is the key to happiness Kumarapala, while taking the fifth anuvrata vowed not to keep more than six crore gold coins eight crore rupees one thousand tolas of precious jewels two thousand pots of ghee and oil two thousand khandis of corn five lac horses one thousand camels one thousand elephants eighty thousand cows five hundred houses five hundred shops besides an army of eleven hundred elephants five thousand chariots eleven lac horses and eighteen lac foot soldiers.⁴³

At the time of taking the first Gunavrata or the sixth vow of a Jain layman Kumarapala had vowed not to stir out of the capital in the monsoon as there was the possibility of the destruction of many lives in that season⁴⁴

41 Ibid 84-5 42 Ibid, p. p. 84-5. 43 Ibid, p. 85

44 These details of Jinapendangani are as confirmed by contemporary chronicles.

When Kumārapāla took the second gunavratā or the seventh vow of a Jain layman he gave up the twenty-two 'abhakshyas' and thirty-two anantakayas, or in short, the food forbidden by the śāstras or Jain Scriptures. He further vowed to take all things after offering them to God. Of the things called 'sachitta', he took only eight 'pans' of 'Nagaravela'. In the rainy season, he gave up all oily substances except ghee, and did not use green vegetables. With certain exceptions, he took his food only once a day, and did not enjoy his wife by day or on 'parvas'. He also abolished taxes on trees, cars and other things⁴⁵

When the King took the first 'Śikṣā vrata' or the tenth vow of a Jain layman, he vowed to perform two 'sāmāyikas' daily⁴⁶

In fulfilment of the Poshadhōpavāsavratā or the eleventh vow of a Jain layman, the king performed 'poshadhas' on holy days, and observing complete fast, did not sleep at night. Most of his time, he spent in meditation, and while observing the vrata, he took particular care to see that no life was destroyed.⁴⁶

When Kumārapāla took the twelfth vow of a

45 Ibid p 87. 46 Ibid; p. 88 46 Ibid, p 88.

Jain layman, he repealed a tax collected from the Jains and asked Ābhada Sheth to improve the condition of the Jains by distributing one thousand gold coins among the deserving. He also requested Hemasūri to keep him constantly informed of the condition of poor Jains. Ābhada Sheth had under Kumārāpala's instructions spent one crore in a year; he was however unwilling to have that sum from the king but the king in order that his twelfth vow might not be broken persuaded him to accept that sum on his behalf⁴⁷.

That Kumārāpala did keep the twelve vows of a Jain layman is confirmed by other evidence. Somaprabhasūri, a contemporary of Kumārāpala informs us that the king received praises from Hemasūri for taking the twelve vows⁴⁸. Merutunga and Chāritrasundarasūri also make a passing reference to this fact. It is certain that the taking of these vows must have been followed by some relevant conduct on the part of Kumārāpala and there is nothing improbable or incredible in the above details furnished by Jinamandanagani.

Kumārāpala then showed his zeal for Jainism

⁴⁷ Ibid, p.p. 88-9

⁴⁸ *Kumārāpala-pratishodha*, p. 319

by making pilgrimages to the holy places of the Jains with the Jain Sangha. The chroniclers, though differing in details, leave us in no doubt that Kumārapāla had undertaken his pilgrimages after hearing the 'tirthamahatmya' from Hemasūri. They further agree in saying that he had visited the holy hills—Satrunjaya and Giranāra. It is certain, as Somaprabhasūri, a contemporary of Kumārapāla, states that the king did not climb Giranāra owing to old age. The chroniclers are, moreover, unanimous in saying that Kumārapāla constructed a trunk road on Giranāra. The officer appointed to superintend the work was Āmradeva, the governor of Saurāstra, as Somaprabha and Jinamandana say, and not Vagbhata as some of the later chroniclers relate. It is also certain that Hemasūri, king's guru, was with him along with the Jain Sangha. There is, however, some difference of opinion as to the route followed by Kumārapāla. Somaprabhasūri who places the pilgrimage before the administration of the twelve vows of a Jain layman, says that the king went first to Giranāra and then to Satrunjaya, while the others say that he first went to Satrunjaya and then to Giranāra. The third view is that he visited these places via Dhandbuka. The probable solution is that

Jain layman, he repealed a tax collected from the Jains and asked Ābhada Sheth to improve the condition of the Jains by distributing one thousand gold coins among the deserving. He also requested Hemasūri to keep him constantly informed of the condition of poor Jains. Ābhada Sheth had, under Kumarapala's instructions, spent one crore in a year he was, however, unwilling to have that sum from the king but the king in order that his twelfth vow might not be broken persuaded him to accept that sum on his behalf.⁴⁷

That Kumarapala did keep the twelve vows of a Jain layman is confirmed by other evidence. Somaprabhasūri, a contemporary of Kumarapala informs us that the king received praises from Hemasūri for taking the twelve vows.⁴⁸ Merutunga and Charitraśundarasūri also make a passing reference to this fact. It is certain that the taking of these vows must have been followed by some relevant conduct on the part of Kumarapala and there is nothing improbable or incredible in the above details furnished by Jinamandanagani.

Kumarapala then showed his zeal for Jainism

⁴⁷ Ibid, p.p. 88-9

⁴⁸ Kumarapala-pratibodha, p. 819

Hemasūri who says, "In almost every village, he, whose wealth is innumerable, will adorn the earth with temples of the Jains."⁵¹ Merutunga says that Kumārapāla built 1440 temples, while Charitrasundaragani puts to his credit 1400 temples. The numbers of Merutunga and Charitrasundara seem to be exaggerated at first sight, but if we examine them in the light of statements of Somaprabhasūri and Hemasūri, they appear to be not far from the truth. It is probable, however, that Merutunga and Charitrasundara may have included in their numbers temples erected with state grants.

The chroniclers then enumerate the important temples of the King. The Dvyāśraya speaks about the Kumāravihāra in Anahilavāda and one more to Parśvanātha in Devapattana.⁵² Yaśahpāla says that the king built the Tribhuvanavihāra thirty-two temples as penance for the sins of his teeth.⁵³ Merutunga adds a few more—the Dikshavihāra in Cambay where Hemasūri was consecrated as a monk and the Jholikavihāra in Dhandhuka on the site of Hemacharya's

⁵¹ Hemasūri, *Mahaviracharita*, XII, 75

⁵² *Dvyāśraya*, XX, 98-9 ⁵³ *Moharājaparājaya*, p. 93, introduction p. IX.

Kumarapala had made two or three pilgrimages to these holy places at different times. There are various reasons for holding this view. Firstly Kumarapala had been under the influence of Hemasturi for a period of more than fourteen years secondly Jinamandanagani, in the general outline of Kumarapala's work says that the king made seven pilgrimages thirdly Rajasekhara puts to his credit two pilgrimages—one to Satrunjaya, Giranara and Devapattana and the other to Cambay. We may therefore give credence to the statement of Jayasimhasuri, Jinamandanagani and Rajasekhara that Kumarapala visited Devapattana and paid obeisance to Chandraprabhu.⁴⁹

Besides proclaiming *amari* and taking the twelve vows of a Jain layman Kumarapala showed his zeal for Jainism by erecting numerous temples in various places. Somaprabhasuri, his contemporary says that Kumarapala built so many temples to the Tirthankaras that 'it was impossible to count them.'⁵⁰ He is supported by

49 The details of Kumarapala's pilgrimages are given in the *Kumarapala-pratibodha*, p. p. 75-8, *Prabandha-shikharita XII* (333-47) *Prabandha-samgraha*, p. p. 233-9 *Kumarapala-prabandha*, p. p. 99 to 104 and other works.

50 *Kumarapala-pratibodha*, p. p. 144-5.

Hemasūri who says, "In almost every village, he, whose wealth is innumerable, will adorn the earth with temples of the Jains"⁵¹ Merutunga says that Kumārapāla built 1440 temples, while Chāritrasundaragani puts to his credit 1400 temples. The numbers of Merutunga and Chāritrasundara seem to be exaggerated at first sight; but if we examine them in the light of statements of Somaprabhasūri and Hemasūri, they appear to be not far from the truth. It is probable, however, that Merutunga and Chāritrasundara may have included in their numbers temples erected with state grants.

The chroniclers then enumerate the important temples of the King. The Dvyāśraya speaks about the Kumāravihāra in Anahilavāda and one more to Parśvanātha in Devapattana.⁵² Yaśahpāla says that the king built the Tribhuvanavihāra thirty-two temples as penance for the sins of his teeth.⁵³ Merutunga adds a few more—the Dikshavihāra in Cambay where Hemasūri was consecrated as a monk and the Jholikavihāra in Dhandhukā on the site of Hemāchārya's

51 Hemasūri, *Mahaviracharita*, XII, 75

52 *Dvyāśraya*, XX, 98-9. 53 *Moharājaparājaya*, p 93, introduction p IX

birth place²⁴ The sites of these temples in Dhandhuka and Oambay can be seen even to-day

Kumarapala's temple on Giranara is situated in the vicinity of Bhimakunda. The Mulsanayaka or the principal deity of the temple is Abhinandanaswami or the fourth Tirthankara. The temple has a big sabhamandapa in the walls of which are several Devakulikas containing images of Tirthankaras. It seems there was at one time a corridor round this temple. In the compound of the temple there are a garden and a step-well.

The temple seems to have suffered at the hands of an iconoclast. An inscription of A. D. 1824 shows that it was repaired by Anandaji Kalyanaji and Hansaraja Jetha.

Kumarapala's temple on the Satrunjaya Hill is one of the oldest on the hill. It is roofed and forms a fine block with low towers. It is dedicated to Adinatha the First Tirthankara. The door is of yellowish stone beautifully carved. The garbhagriha has a beautiful canopy of bluish marble over the head of Rishabhadeva. There is a big hall where the devotees offer prayers. In the niches we see the images of different

Tirthankaras On Jain holidays, the images are profusely adorned. The images of Śāsanadevatās are supposed to guard the temple. The Jinalaya is kept in such a state of constant repairs that it is difficult to say how much of it belongs to the time of Kumārapāla.

Kumārapāla's temple on the Tāranga Hill (near Mehsana) is dedicated to Ajitanātha, the second Tirthankara. At the main entrance, there are eight pillars of the biggest size with carving at the bottom as well as at the top. On the north and the south, the entrance is supported by two similar pillars. The temple has a big sabhā-mandapa which is used by the devotees as a prayer Hall. In the walls of the Sabhamandapa, there are several niches containing the images of Tirthankaras and Śāsanadevatās. The central dome is supported on eight pillars beautifully carved. Eight statues with various musical instruments are represented as standing on the pillars. Near the garbhagriha, however, there are two simple pillars. In the garbhāra there is a colossal idol of Ajitanātha. On both the sides of it, ladders are provided for its worship. The image which we see to-day in the temple is not the one originally set up by Kumārapāla. It

was set up by Govinda Sanghavi in A. D. 1423, and seems to have suffered though not much, at the hands of an iconoclast.

Besides the idol of Ajitanatha there are several images of Tirthankaras which must have been replaced after A. D. 1423. Unlike other Jain temples we do not find here a bhamati or corridor. The height of the temple is about forty-two yards.

Inside the temple there is a way up the labyrinth where it is not advisable to go without a lamp or with children. Moreover it is not possible for three or four men to go there at a time and in a line. One noticeable feature of this labyrinth is the kegara wood which is used in it.

Outside the temple there is beautiful carving on the walls. On all sides there are statues of men and women as well as gods and goddesses. Men are adorned with bracelets armlets anklets and ear-ornaments some of them are represented with a loin-cloth only probably because they are going to the temple to worship the Tirthankara's image. Statues of women are represented in full dress profusely adorned with bracelets armlets anklets necklaces and earrings. It is interesting to note that none of them has

ornaments for the nose, probably because in those days their use was uncommon. Some images of gods and goddesses are in a meditating posture; others are represented as going to the temple with materials of worship. Some of these statues are mutilated, but most of them are well-preserved. All these statues are bare-footed.

The *Mahāvīracarita* speaks of one superb edifice of Kumārapāla in Anahīlavāda. According to Hemasūri, Kumārapāla once heard from his guru about the Jain statue consecrated by Kapila and formed a desire to dig up the sandy place and bring the all consecrating statue to Anahīlavāda. With the consent of his preceptor, he ordered his officials to dig up the sandy place and bring the statue. The place of Vitabhaya was dug up and the statue was brought to Anahīlavāda in great pomp. Then erecting a superb temple in a pleasure-house near his palace, the king set up the image and worshipped the same thrice a day.⁵⁵

Kumārapāla gave one more proof of his devotion to Jina by instituting car-festivals. In the Kumāravibhāra, he held the Athaimahotsava or the eight days' festival, performed "snātra" puja and sat by the side of his preceptor with

⁵⁵ Hemasūri, *Mahāvīracarita*, XII, 72 to 74

folded hands. On the full-moon day of Chaitra, a monastic procession attended by the king his feudatories public servants and citizens started from the Kumāravihara. An image of Parśvanātha was set up in a car and exhibited to the Public eye. When the procession came to the palace gate Kumārāpala worshipped the image of Parśvanātha set up in the chariot, in the presence of the congregation and waved lights before it. The chariot of the Jina driven by elephants was led in procession for eight days and exhibited to the public eye. In the month of Āśvin also the king celebrated the car festival for nine days and asked his feudatories to glorify Jainism. The latter obeyed royal commands by building Jain temples holding car-festivals and honouring Jain monks.⁵⁶

Somsrabhasūri's account of the car-festivals is confirmed by Hemasūri. In the *Mahāvīracarita* it is said "On the whole earth, as far as the ocean, he will cause the statues of the Arhat to be borne in procession on cars in every village in every town."⁵⁷ The verse adds to our knowledge by informing us that the car-festivals were not

⁵⁶ Kumārāpālāvatibodha, p. p. 174-5.

⁵⁷ Hemasūri *Mahāvīracarita*, XII, 76.

confined to the capital only, but were caused to be instituted "in every village, in every town" in the kingdom

In spite of this widespread activity in the spirit of the Jain doctrine, it is said that as in some inscriptions he is described as 'Umāpati-varalabdhaprasad' or prospering through the favour of Śiva or as an ardent devotee of Śiva, he had not embraced Jainism but only cultivated regard for it. It is true that in an inscription of his dated V S 1220 or A D 1163-4, he is described as prospering through the favour of Śiva. Other inscriptions in which he is so described are either prior to the date of his conversion or belong to later reigns. The epithet, however, seems to be traditional and does not convey the meaning which it is sought to imply. It seems to have been first borne by Mularāja who was, beyond doubt, an ardent devotee of Śiva and later on applied to his successors without discrimination. In support of this view, a parallel from History is quoted. Before the Reformation found a footing in England, Henry VIII (1509-1547 A D) had written a book against Martin Luther, a German monk, who was trying to reform the Church; and the Pope, as a mark of favour, had conferred on Henry VIII the title

of the "Defender of the Faith" which he continued to hold even though he had revolted against the Faith and which his successors have borne even unto this day although it has ceased to imply what its grantor meant. In the same way it is by no means improbable that Kumarapala who had obtained the throne after passing through many vicissitudes of life and who had during the early years of his life made some grants to Siva temples may have been described "Umapati varalabdhasasad," when it ceased to have any meaning. Other evidence also leads us to the same conclusion. Firstly an inscription of his reign dated V Samvat 1221 or A. D. 1165 describes him as "Paramarhat" or the excellent follower of Jina." Secondly in the Preface to the Santinathacharita of V. S. 1227 or A. D. 1170-71, Kumarapala is called Paramaravaka or an orthodox Jain. Thirdly Yashapala, a contemporary of the king has written the *Mahapardjaya* an allegorical drama to celebrate the conversion of Kumarapala to Jainism. Fourthly Somaprabhasuri another contemporary of the king has written the *Kumarapalapratibodha* entirely dealing with the teaching of Jainism to

Kumārāpāla by Hemasūri. Fifthly, the later chroniclers including the Brahmin Someśvara are unanimous in saying that Kumārāpāla had embraced Jainism⁵⁹ Sixthly, Someśvara who describes the relations of his ancestors to the Anahilavāda Kings in the *Śunāthotsava* says nothing about their intercourse with Kumārāpāla, probably because the king who had embraced Jainism was not much concerned with his Brahmin Purohita. Seventhly, tradition has preserved his name in the list of excellent followers of Jina. He is remembered twice a day by the Jains in their temples—in the morning at the time of worshipping the Jineśvara with flowers⁶⁰ and in the evening at the time of Āratī or the waving of lights before the image⁶¹. In the light of all this evidence, we unhesitatingly conclude that Kumārāpāla had embraced Jainism.

Though Kumārāpāla had embraced Jainism, he did not forget the royal duty of encouraging his subjects in their pious and religious works, so when Bhava Brihaspati requested him to

59 *Kirtī Kaumudī*, II, 43, 50, 51.

६० पंच कोटींना फुले, जेना सीज्यां काज ।

राजा कुमारपालने, आप्या देश अदार ॥

६१ आरती उतारी राजा कुमारपाले ।

repair the temple of Somanatha he readily consented to do so."

We shall now say a few words about Kumarapala's principal officers. In those days the heads of different departments of the state provincial Governors prime ministers and Dandanayakas were known as mantris or ministers and acted as commanders of the army.

According to the *Dryastraya*, Vagbhata was a Prime Minister of Kumarapala.⁶² This fact is confirmed by the Nadola copperplates of V S. 1213.⁶³ It is difficult to say who this Vagbhata was. Probably he was the son of Udayana who built a stone temple to Adinatha on the Śatrunjaya Hill in V S. 1211 (or A. D. 1154-5) and founded Vagbhatapura at the foot of the hill. In this city Vagbhata built a temple of Parśvanatha and called it Tribhuvanavihāra after the King's father.⁶⁴

Ambada or Amrabhata was another mantri of Kumarapala. He was the second son of Udayana. We have already seen him in connection with his expedition against Mallikarjuna. He

62. *Bhavanagara Inscriptions* p. 127 v. 11.

63. *Dryastraya*, IX 91-2. 64 *I. A.* (1912), p. 202.

65. *Prabandhakāśīnāmā*, p. 220.

built the Śakunīkavihāra in Broach in V. S. 1211 (or V. S. 1222)⁶⁶ The Jains of Broach believe that the remains of this temple are found in a mosque.

The Udepur inscription of V S 1222 informs us that Chāhada was a dandanāyaka of Kumārāpāla in Malwā.⁶⁷ He was probably Chāhada, third son of Udayana. From an inscription on Giranara, it seems he had seven sons, the eldest of whom was a treasurer of Kumārāpāla.⁶⁸ By dint of merit, he (the eldest son) rose to the rank of Prime Minister. From the Praśasti to the *Prithvichandra-charita* of Śantisūri, it is clear that Kumārasimha, Chāhada's eldest son, was the Prime minister in V S. 1225.⁶⁹

The Kīrādu inscription of V S. 1209 and the Bāli inscription of V S 1216 speak of Mahādeva as the Prime Minister of the king.^{69A} We do not

66 Jayasimhasūri, *Kumārāpālacharita*, VIII, 642, Jinamandana, *Kumārāpālāprabandha*, p 74, as the temple was built according to the wishes of his father, it is more probable that it was built sometime after his death in V S 1211. 67 I. A., XVIII, 344. 68 *Prāchīna Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, introduction, p p 92-4. 69 Dalal, *Jesalmer Catalogue*, p 11. 69A. *Prachina Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, No 346; *Gujaratano Madhyakalīna Rājput Itihās*, II, p 318.

know much about this Mahadeva. He was probably the son of Dadaka, a Prime Minister of Siddharaja, and the governor of Ujjain in V S 1195. He does not seem to have held the post of the Prime Minister from V S 1209 to V S 1216 because the Nadola Copperplates inform us that Vagbhat was the Prime Minister in V S 1213. Mahadeva seems to have fallen from power after Kumarapala's formal conversion to Jainism in V S 1216 because Yasodhavala was the prime minister between V S 1218 and 1220.⁷⁰ Kumarasimha about whom more has been said above was the Prime minister in V S 1225 and Vadhoyana in V S 1237.⁷¹ The Pragaṣṭi to the Mallinathacharita informs us that Prithvipala was a Prime Minister of Kumarapala. This Prithvipala repaired Vinaya Shah's temple on Mt. Abu.⁷² The names of Kapardi and Aliga are also recorded in the Prabandhas.

In V S 1202 Sahajiga was the dandanayaka of Saurashtra;⁷³ in V S 1207 Sajjan was the

70. Deas: *Jain Sahitya no Itihasa*, p. 279; I. A. XVIII p. 242. 71. *Jaisalmer Catalogue*, p. 17 p. 23. 72. *Apabhramsa Kavyatrayi*, p. 79. 73. *Prachina Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, No. 157. 74. *Revised List of Antiquarian Remains in the Bombay Presidency*, p. 246.

dandanāyaka of Chitoda⁷⁵ We do not know who this Sajjana was He was probably the dandanāyaka of Saurāstra in the time of Siddharāja and built the stone temple on Giranāra. In V S 1210, 1213 and 1216, Vajaladeva was the dandanāyaka of Nādola⁷⁶ In V S 1222, Āmbaka, son of Rāniga, was the dandanāyaka of Saurāstra⁷⁷

Among the samants of Kumārāpāla, there were Vapanadeva of Godhra, Paramāra Someśvara of Kīrādu, Ālhanadeva of Nādola and many others⁷⁸ They were required to serve their overlord personally and many a time lived at Anahilapataka We have already seen how Dhāravarsha of Chandrāvati accompanied Āmrabhata, in his expedition against Mallikarjuna and Alhanadeva went against the rebel chiefs of Saurāstra If they incurred the displeasure of their overlord, they were deposed

Like his predecessor Siddharāja, Kumārāpāla was a great patron of learning and the learned The most learned man of this age

75 Epig. Ind, II, p 422 76 *Prachīna Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, No 326, *Gujaratano Madhyakalīna Rajput Itihas*, II, p 320 77. *Prachīna Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, Nos 50-51. 78 *Gujaratano Madhyakalīn Itihas*, II, pp. 323-4

was Hemasūri, his preceptor. We have already dealt with the *Siddha-Hema*, a very well-known work of this remarkable Jain monk. The Success of the *Siddha-Hema* induced Hemasūri to write many more works intended to give the students of Sanskrit compositions complete instructions for expressing themselves elegantly and correctly. In this series come the *Abhidhānashikṣāmaṇi*, the *Anekārthasaṅgraha*, the *Alaṅkāraśuddhimaṇi* and the *Chhandānukāṣaṇa*. The *Dvayārayamaṇi-kāvyā* was also written to illustrate the rules of his grammar as well as to give the history of the Chaulukya. His other works are the commentaries on the *Abhidhānashikṣāmaṇi*, *Anekārthasaṅgraha*, and *Nāmaṇḍala Yogabādhā Trisāstisādhakapuruṣaśāhara*. *Vīraśaṅgastotra*, *KuṇḍrapālaChakriyam*, *Nighaṇṭu*, *Seṣha Arhanta*, *Dvāstrimsikā*, *Mahādevastotra* and many others.

Hemasūri died in V S 1259 (1172-3 A D)

Ramachandrasūri was a prominent pupil of Hemasūri. He wrote the *Dravyāṅkāravṛtti* in V S 1202 (A D 1145-6). He is called *Śataprabandhakartu* or the author of a hundred works but it is more probable that he wrote a book called the *Śataprabandha*. His other works are the *Kuṇḍrapālaśāhaka*, *Kuṇḍrapāla*

nandanam, *Dvātrimsaka*, *Nalavilās*, *Nirbhayabhī-*
maryāyoga, *Rāghavābhyudaya*, *Yādavābhyudaya*,
Mallikāmakarandaprakarana, *Rohinimrigāṅka-*
prakarana, *Vanamāla Nāṭikā*, *SudhaKalaśa*,
Harima-BṛihadvṛttiNyāsa, *Vyatikṛta Dvātrimsika*,
Ādi-devastava, *Munisuvratastava*, *Nemiṣṭava*,
Sādhārana Jina stava, etc.⁷⁹

Rāmachandra was the Joint author of the *Dravyālankāravṛtti* and *Nāṭyadarpanavṛtti*. Siddharāja had conferred on him the title Kavikatāramalla. Merutunga says that he was one-eyed. After Kumārapāla's death, he was made to sit on red hot copper when he joyfully met his death by biting his tongue.^{79A}

Gunachandra, Mahendra, Vardhamāna, Devachandra, Udayachandra and Bālachandra were the pupils of Hemasūri. Of these, Gunachandra was the joint author of the *Dravyālankāravṛtti* and *Nāṭyadarpanavṛtti*. Mahendrasūri wrote the *Anekārtha Kāvavākaraśaumudī* in V S 1241 and Vardhamānagani composed the *Kumāravāhārapraśasti*. Devachandra was the author of the *Chandralekṣhā vijayaprakarana*. Bālachandra was

79 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, pp 321-3, *Jesalmer Catalogue*, Introduction, p 27. 79A. Merutunga, *Prabandhachintāmani*, pp 247-8

a rival of Ramachandra. After Kumarpala's death he took the side of Ajaypala and caused the death of Ramachandra. He is said to be the author of the *Snatasya* a poem very well-known to the Jains.⁸⁰

Besides Hemastūri and his pupils there were many persons who did render "glorious and meritorious services to the devotees of Sarasvatī. Jinabhadramunindra pupil of Śalibhadra was the author of the *Malapagaravakaha* in Samvat 1204 (A. D. 1148),⁸¹

Jinasakharastūri was the pupil of Jinavallabha and guru of Padmachandrasūri. He belonged to the Kharataragatahha and founded the Rudrapaliya Kharatara śekha in V Samvat 1204 (A. D. 1148). He was the author of the *Samyaktasaptatika Śīlatarangina* and the *Prabhattaravālā vratta*.⁸²

Chandrasena pupil of Pradyumna was the author of the *Utopādanddhīprakarana* in V

⁸⁰ Desai Loc. cit., p. 224. ⁸¹ Peterson, IV p. XXXIX; Hiralal Hansaraja *Jain Dharmaṇa Prākāśa Itihāsa*, I, p. 87. ⁸² Ind. Ant., XI, p. 245; Hiralal Hansaraja, Loc. cit., I, p. 23; Peterson, IV p. XLIII; Weber II, p. 1033.

Samvat 1207 (A. D 1151) He was assisted by Nemichandra in this work⁸³

Śrichandrasūri, pupil of Śalibhadra and Dhaneśvarasūri, wrote a commentary on the *Jatakālpa* in V S 1207 (A. D 1151) He was also the author of the *Pratishthākālpa*.⁸⁴

Govindaganī, pupil of Devanayasūri (?), wrote a commentary on the *Karmastava* before V S. 1218 (A D 1162)⁸⁵

Paramānanda was the author of a commentary on the *Karmavipākā* of Garga. He gives his spiritual genealogy as follows—

(1) Bhadreśvarasūri (2) Śantisūri (3) Abhayadevasūri (4) Paramānanda He flourished in V S 1221 (A D 1165) in the reign of Kumārapāla in which year a copy of the *Tīloyasundarikāhā* of Devendraganī was written at the expense of certain Jains⁸⁶ who had profited by his instructions

Vimalachandra was a 'Bandhu' of Vadi

83 Peterson, III, app p. 209, IV, p XXVIII, Hiralal Hansaraja, Loc cit., I, p 32 84 Peterson, V, p. LXXXIV, V, app. p. 64 85 Hiralal Hansaraja, Loc cit I, p 81, Peterson, V, p XV 86 Peterson, IV, p LXXVI.

Devasūri of the Brihadgatchha. He was the author of the *Prānottararatnamālīkā* and flourished about V S 1226 (A. D 1170)*

Chandrasūri was a pupil of Vijayasimhasūri who was a pupil of Hemachandra Malladhari and belonged to the Harshapuriyagatchha. He was the author of the *Sangrahaniratna* in Prakrit. He wrote commentaries on the *Āvasyakasūtra* and *Niryavali* in V S. 1222 (A. D 1166) and S 1328 (A. D 1172) respectively**

Harihadrāsūri, pupil of Ānandasūri and Amarasūri and guru of Vijayasimhasūri in the Nāgendra gatchha was called *Kalikālagautama*. He was the author of the *Tatvaprabodha*.*

Pradyumnasūri, pupil of Mahendrasūri who was the pupil of Vadi Devasūri wrote the *Vādasthalan*. He flourished in the first half of the 13th. century of Vikrama.

Jinapati pupil of Jinachandra and guru of Jinēvara in the Kharataragatchha was the author of the commentary on the *Panchalingapralarāna* of Jinēvara.* His other works are the *Characharī*

87 Peterson I, app. p. 15; Hiralal Hansaraja, *Loc. cit.*, I, p. 120 68 Peterson, III app. pp 8 123 I app. p. 75 p 8, IV p. XXVIII, Hiralal Hansaraja, *Loc. cit.*, I, p. 81. 89 Peterson, IV p. OXI. 90. Peterson, III, app. pp. 222 and 223.

a *stotra* and commentary on the *Saṅghapattaka* and *Samāchāripātra*. His dates are birth, A. D. 1154, diksha, A. D. 1162, padasthāpana by Jayadevaśārya in A. D. 1167 and death in A. D. 1221. According to the *Tīrthakalpa*, Jinapati consecrated an image of Mahāvīra in Kalyān in A. D. 1177⁹¹

Ratnaprabhasūri, pupil of Bhadrāsvara who was a pupil of Devasūri of the Brīhad gachha, was the author of a commentary on the *Upadeśamālā* of Dharmadasagani. He also wrote a commentary on the *Syādvādaratnākara* of Devasūri⁹²

Somaprabhasūri was a pupil of Jayasimhasūri who was a pupil of Devasūri of the Tapa Gachha. He was the author of the *Sumatīnātha charita*, *Suktimuktāvali*, *Satārthakāvya* and *Kumārāpālāpratibodha*⁹³

The last work contains an authentic account of the conversion of Kumārāpāla to Jainism. The work is of great historical value because our author was a contemporary of Kumārāpāla

91 Peterson, IV, pp XXXVI, *Jain Itihāsa*, p 106

92 *Jain Itihāsa*, p 105 93 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihāsa*, pp 283-4

and Hemasūri. He is also said to have written the *Sringāravandhyataranginī*.*

Malayagiri was a great commentator. He wrote commentaries on the Agamas. He was the author of the following works:—

- (1) *Avasyaka Brihadvṛtti*
- (2) *Oghaniryuktā vṛtti*
- (3) *Chandrapragṇapti tika*
- (4) *Jvābhigama vṛtti*
- (5) *Jyotiskaranda tika*
- (6) *Nandī tika*
- (7) *Pindaniryuktā vṛtti*
- (8) *Pragṇāpana vṛtti*
- (9) *Bṛhatkalpa Pithika*
- (10) *Bhagavats Dvitiyaśalaka vṛtti*
- (11) *Rajaprasaṅga vṛtti*
- (12) *Vishādvasyaka vṛtti*
- (13) *Vyasaśāstratāra vṛtti*
- (14) *Suryapragṇapti vṛtti*
- (15) A commentary on the *Kakṛasāstra* of Jinabhadra

*4. Hiraṇṇī Hansikya, loc cit, I, p. 136. 95. Desai, Loc cit, p. 274.

(16) *Karmapratrut*

(17) *Dharmasangrahaṇi tikā*

(18) *Dharmasāra tilā*

(19) *Panchasangraha vṛtti*

(20) *Shadaśvi vṛtti*

(21) A commentary on the *Saptatikā*

(22) The *Sabdānuśāsana* (an original work on grammar containing 6000 verses)

Lakshmanagani wrote the *Supārśvanātha Charita* in Mandalipuri (Mandala) The work Contains 10,000 verses and deals with the life of Supārśvanātha, the seventh Tirthankara of the Jains This Lakshmanagani was a pupil of Hemacandrasūri Malladhari "

Siddhapāla, son of Sripāla, was a great poet. Many learned Jain monks lived in his Upāśraya or monastery. He was a favourite of Kumārapāla and the latter, at times, listened to his sermon. The *Kumārapālapratiḥodha* of Somaprabhasūri contains one such sermon. Siddhapāla flourished between V S 1211 and 1250 (A. D. 1155 and 1194)

Chandrasūri, pupil of Devendrasūri of Chandra-

were many Jains who could not write books themselves but who spent much money in making copies of the books written in this as well as previous reigns. Kumārapsāla, himself, was a patron of learning and the learned and opened twenty-one Libraries in his kingdom. He had, moreover, employed 700 copyists to make copies of the works of Hemasūri¹⁰³

The Praśasti to the *Śāntināthacharita* of Devachandrasūri contains valuable information about the family of Rahad of Prāgvatavamśa. Siddhināga was the ancestor of Rahad. He had a wife named Ambini. Siddhināga and Ambini had four sons—Podhaka, Virada, Vardhana and Dronaka. The sons set up an image of Śāntinātha in the temple of Śāntinātha in Dāhoda. The image was worshipped in Dadhipadra or Dāhoda at least upto V S 1227 or A D. 1169-70.

Podhaka had three sons—Ambudatta, Ambuvaradhana and Sajjana. He set up two images of Parśvanātha and Suparśvanātha in the temple of Mahāvira in Madahrūt (modern Mudhara, near Abu). Podhaka's two daughters entered the order

¹⁰³ Jinamandanagani, *Kumārappīlaprabandha* p p. 96-7.

of Jain nuns and came to be known as Yashār and Śivadevi

Sajjana had a wife named Mahalatehhi who was a great donor and five sons—Dhavalā Visalā Desalā, Rahadā and Bahad. Dhavalā had two sons—Virachandra and Devachandra and a daughter named Siri. Virachandra had five sons named Vijaya Ajaya Raja Amba and Salana.

Bahadā had a wife named Jinamati and a son named Jasaduka

Rahadā was intelligent, popular religious and noble-minded. He worshipped the image of Jina according to the rules of his faith, praised the Jain monks, listened to their sermons, gave money in charity to the poor, performed penance to the best of his abilities and observed the vows of a Jain layman. Rahadā had four sons named Chahad, Bohadī, Aradā and Anādharā, and five daughters—in-law named Anvadevi, Mṇndhi, Madu Teguya and Rajuka. Yaśodhara, Yaśodhira, Yaśahkarna, were Rahadā's grand sons and Ghuya Jasuka and Jayantuka his grand-daughters

Bohadī second son of Rahadā was out off in the prime of life. So the Śatmāthakarata was

written at the request of Rahada in V S 1227 or A. D 1170-71, in the reign of "Suśravaka Kumārapāla "

The *Prabandhaśhīntāmanī* gives us information about Ābhada, a rich Jain, of the time of Kumārapāla. Ābhada began life as a poor man. Once fortune smiled upon him and he became very rich. He was a follower of Hemasūri, and performed the religious ceremonies of the Jains with great faith. He was a great donor.¹⁰⁴

Chhadaka Sheth and Kubera were Jain multi-millionaires of the time of Kumārapāla. According to Yasahpāla, a contemporary of Kubera, Kubera had six crore gold coins, 8000 mans of Silver, 80 mans of Jewels, 50 000 horses, 1000 Elephants, 80,000 cows, 500 ploughs, 500 shops, 500 carriages etc.¹⁰⁵

In the *Mahāvīrachārīta*, Hemasūri lets the Tirthankara make the following prophecy to Prince Abhaya about the extent of Kumārapāla's Empire —

" He will conquer the region of Kubera (i e.

104. *Prabandhaśhīntāmanī* (Shastri's Translation), p p. 181-2 105 *Moharājaparājaya*, III, 39-42. These details are not confirmed by other evidence

the north) as far as the kingdom of the Turushkas that of Indra (the East) as far as the Ganges that of Yama. (South) as far as Vindhya and the west as far as the Ocean." (XII, v 52).

This statement of Hemasūri, Kumārapala's contemporary is substantially justified. Kumārapala's victory over the Sapadalakha dēva added the territories of the Obohana King to his Empire. The defeat of Mallikarjuna gave him Thana and Colaba Districts over which the Silhara King held sway. He had inherited Gujarat, Cutch, Kathiawar, Malwa and Mewar from Siddharaja, his predecessor.

The Sodhadī var inscription of this reign gives us valuable information about the custom duties. At the custom house of Mangrol duties were levied on carts full of corn, donkeys loaded with goods and camels loaded with betel leaves. Owners of fields had at times to pay certain duties. These were payable in cash. At times, duties were payable in kind.*

Kumārapala was poisoned by his nephew Ajayapala and died in S 1329 (A. D. 1172-3). He was the greatest of all the Solanki kings

* *Epigraphia Indica* p. 148

that adorned the throne of Anahilavada. In his reign, the empire reached its zenith. Kumarapala maintained the same with a firm hand. His predecessor Siddharaja, though a great and popular king, cannot merit comparison with him. He did not hold sway over as large a territory as Kumarapala. Konkana was not conquered by him, and the Sapadalaksha king was his friend, and ally rather than his feudatory. He was not a great statesman in as much as he did not make proper arrangements for the defence of the capital when he went on a pilgrimage to Somanatha with his mother. Naravarman invaded Gujarat and Santu Mantri had to give him gold to induce him to retire. The Chahmans, moreover, claim that they, for some time, succeeded in occupying the capital under the leadership of Yojaka.¹⁰⁷

Madanavarma of Mahobakapura defeated him. This is one of the reasons why Merutunga calls him a coward in battle. Jayasinha's personal character, moreover, was not good. He relentlessly persecuted Kumarapala for no fault of his. Merutunga's statement that he was not a 'paradara-sahodara' or a brother to the wives of others is very suggestive. The same seems to be confirm-

ed by the bards who speak at great length about Jayasimha's undesirable relations to Jazama and other women.

In Jayasimha's reign "peace, safety, tranquillity and good government" of Gujarat were in danger for some time in Kumarapala's reign, on the other hand, no invader dared knock at the gates of Gujarat. Jayasimha moreover was engaged in wars and conquests for the major part of his reign. His great victory over the King of Malwa was won in V. S. 1192-3 only a few years before his death. He must have therefore found very little time for reforms. Most of the conquests of Kumarapala, on the other hand, were over before V. S. 1208 and he had considerable time at his disposal to think of the welfare of his people. By enforcing prohibition, he improved the condition of the middle classes and labourers. By forbidding injury to living creatures he encouraged agriculture and lowered the cost of living. By declaring gambling and adultery illegal, he raised the tone of public morals. The king won the blessings of weeping widows and his other subjects by giving up the practice of confiscating the property of a person dying without an heir.

Kumarapala's character was spotless. Meru-

tunga says that he was a 'paradārasahodara' or a brother to the wives of others and the same is confirmed by Mahmud Ufi, a Muslim historian ¹⁰⁸ The latter chronicler says that Kumārapāla "surpassed all other rulers in Hindustan in good qualities and amiable disposition" and exercised power "with a right appreciation of the duties of a ruler" Remembering his own days of adversity, Kumārapāla "afforded full protection and Justice to his subjects, ruling with impartiality and equity" ¹⁰⁹

The above account of Mahmud Ufi deserves our full credence as it comes from a historian who had no reason to exaggerate, and as it is confirmed by Hemasūri, a contemporary chronicler, who says that "he will lead his people to the highest welfare, protecting it as a father." ¹¹⁰

In fine, we conclude that Kumārapāla was the greatest king of the Solauki dynasty of Anahilavāda and that he must rank very high in the list of good rulers of India

After Kumārapāla's death, Ajayapāla came to the throne He was the worst king on

108 Elliot, *History of India*, II, pp 169-70

109 Elliot, *History of India*, II, pp 168-69.

110 *Mahāvīracharita*, XII, 47.

the throne of Anhilavada. The policy of religious toleration followed by Mularaja and his successors since 942 A. D. was for the first time given up after 231 years. There was no freedom of conscience. The temples of Kumarapala were demolished one after another and used as gambling houses till Silana, a jester persuaded the king to desist from the work of destruction. (A)

The reign of terror had commenced. Kapardi a minister of Kumarapala, was put to death. Ramachandrasuri, a prominent pupil of Hemasuri, was made to seat on a heated plate of copper and Amrabhatta was asked to prepare for battle in which he died. (B)

Ajayapala's reign of terror was cut short by Vajaladeva a doorkeeper who stabbed him in A. D. 1176

Yasahpala was a Jain minister of Ajayapala. He completed the *Mohapardajaya* an allegorical drama celebrating the conversion of Kumarapala to Jainism in this reign. His father's name was Dhanadeva and mother's name Rukmini. Dhanadeva was a minister of Siddharaja or Kumarapala. (C)

(A) *Prabandhasalinīlāmami* pp. 245-6

(B) *Ibid* pp. 246-8

(C) *M. ruitunga* *Ibid* p. 242.

Narapati, son of Āmradeva of Dhara, completed the *Narapatiyayacharchā* in Anahilāvāda in V S 1232, (A. D. 1176).(D)

Pradyumna, pupil of Mahendrasūri, who was pupil of Vādi Devasūri, wrote the *Vādasthala*. In reply Jinapatisūri of the Kharataragatchha wrote the *Prabodhyavādasthala*. Jinpati's other works are the *Tīrthamālā*, *Sanghapattaka tīkā* and *Panchalinguvarana* (E).

Ratnaprabhasūri, pupil of Bhadreśvarasūri who was a pupil of Devasūri of the Brihad Gatchha, was the author of a commentary on the Upadeśamālā of Dharmadāsaganī in V S. 1238 (A. D. 1182). He also wrote a commentary on the *Syādvādaratnākara* of Devasūri.^F

Ajayapāla was succeeded by his son Bāla Mularāja who ruled for only two years. The latter was succeeded by his brother Bhīma II. During these two reigns, the policy of Ajayapāla was given up and people had full freedom of Conscience. The Jains could peacefully worship

(D) Velankara, Nos 380-4

(E) Peterson, IV, pp XXXVI-VII, Hīrālāl Hansarāja, *Jain Itihāsa*, p. 36.

F Peterson, IV, p CII; Hīrālāl Hansarāja, *Loc Cit*, p 36

their Vitarāga Deva and Sarasvatī the goddess of learning

Hemaprabhasūri, pupil of Yaśoghoshasūri, wrote the *Prāśnottararatnamālā vṛtti* in V S 1248 (A. D. 1187) at the request of Haripala mantri. He belonged to the Purnamika gatchha.*

Āśada was the son of Katnkarāja and Ānabdevī of Śrīmāla vamsa. He was an orthodox Jain Abhayadevasūri the "Kālikālagautama" was his guru. Āśada's works are the *Upadeśabandha*, *Jinastotra* and a commentary on the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa. Rājada Āśada's son died a premature death so Āśada wrote the *Vivekamanjari* to ease himself. He was known as "Kavisabha-snogara."†

Udayasimha wrote a commentary on the *Dharmadāś* of Sriprabhasūri in V S 1253.‡

Devasūri of Jhaliharsgatchha was a pupil of Devendra and Haribhadrāsūri. He composed the *Padmaprabhacarita* in Prakrit in V S 1254.‡

Purnabhadrasūri pupil of Jinapatisūri of Kharataragatchha compiled the *Panchābhyanata*.‡

G. Jambhara Catalogue No. 90

H. Peterson, V 48; II, 55 III 12. J. Dorai, Loc. cit. p. 229 K-L. Ibid p. 340 Purnabhadra's other works are The *Atmanāthacarita*, *Dāśarvāthacarita*, *Dharmasāhibhadracarita*, *Kṛtsūnyacarita*, etc

Nemichandra who was converted by Jina-patisūri of Kharataragatohha wrote the *Satthiṣaya* in Prakrit. His son entered the order of Jain monks and came to be known as Jineśvarasūri.^M

Malayaprabha, pupil of Mānatungasūri, wrote a commentary on the *Siddhajayanti*, a work of his spiritual preceptor,^N in V S. 1260

Tilakachāraya of Chandragatohha was a pupil of Sivaprabha. He gives his spiritual lineage as follows — (1) Chandraprabhasūri (2) Dharmagosha (3) Chakreśvarasūri (4) Sivaprabha (5) Tilakachārya. He was the author of the *Āvasyakalaghuvṛtti* in which he was helped by his pupil Padmaprabha in V S. 1296 (A. D. 1240). His other works are the *Pratyekabuddha-Charita* in V S 1261 (A. D. 1205), the *Jitakalpavṛtti* in V S 1274 (A. D. 1218), the *Samyaktvaparakaranavṛtti* in V. S. 1277 (A. D. 1221), the *Daśavaikāṇikāṭikā*, the *Śrāvaka-prāyascītasāmāhāri*, *Pratyākhyānalaghuvṛtti*, *Śrāvaka-pratīkramanasūtravṛtti*, *Śādhupratīkramanasūtravṛtti*, and *Pāṭhshukasūtra*.^P

M Bhāndūrakara, IV, 149, Velankara, Nos 1670-72.

N Peterson, III, 37.

P Jesalmere Catalogue, introduction, p 20.

Jinapala pupil of Jinapatisūri of Kharatara-gatohha wrote a commentary on the *Shatatanak*.^Q

Dharmaghoshasūri pupil of Jayasimhasūri of Anohalagatohha and guru of Mahendrasūri was the author of the *Saptapadatika* in V S. 1263 (A. D. 1207). The book is written in the form of questions and answers.^R

Devendrasūri pupil of Dhaneśvarasūri of Nagendragatohha composed the *Chandraprabhacharita* in Somesvarapura (Somanatha Pattana) in V S. 1254 (nr A. D. 1197-8). He is said to have founded Serisa tirth, near Kalol in the Mehsana District of Bombay State.^(S)

Jinadattasūri founder of the Vayatiya-gatohha, flourished about V S. 1265 (A. D. 1209). He helped many persons to embrace Jainism. He is known as the author of the *Sri Jinendracharita* the *Vivakavilasa* and the *Sutanasastra*. He accompanied Vastupala in his pilgrimage to holy places in V S. 1277 (A. D. 1221).^(T)

Q. Buhlar VI, No 776. R. Petersen 66.

(S) Buhlar II No 347 and III 164, Jain Yuga, I, p. 163.

(T) Petersen I app p. 3; Hirañkṣi Hansarāja, Jain Itihāsa p. 80.

Vijayapāla, grand son of Śrīpāla, composed the *Draupadī-svayamvara*, a Sanskrit drama in two acts. At the desire of Bhīma II of Anahilavāda, it was staged in the Tripurushaprāsāda at the time of a spring festival and was much appreciated by the people of the capital (v)

In V. S. 1247, Sobhanadeva was the Governor of Lāṭa deśa and Ratnasimha the Mudradhikāri. Āmbada mantri and Ālhādana Dandanayaka were the other Jain officers of Bhīma II. They were brothers of Gallaka kula and regarded the monks of the Nāgendra-gaṭhha as their preceptors. Their ancestor Vādhu built a temple to Mahāvīra in Sangama Khetaka (probably modern Kaira which is situated on the confluence of the rivers Shodhi and Vātraka). His son Kapardi built a temple to Ādinātha in Vatasara. Kapardi had a son named Amradeva whose son Devachandra had four sons—Āmbada mantri, Jhathana, Ālhādana Dandanayaka, and Pralhadana. After Āmbada mantri's death, Ālhādana Dandanayaka set up the images of Rishabhadeva, Chandraprabhu, Simandharaswami and Ambika in Satyapura or Sachora. At his request, Vardhamanasūri, pupil of Vijayasimhasūri of Nāgendra-gaṭhha, composed

the *Vāsupuṣṭyācārita* in Anahilavada in V S 1299 (or A. D 1943) (w).

Dharavarsha, King of Mt. Abu and a feudatory of the king of Anahilavada, composed the *Parthoparāṭkramavyākhyāna* founded Prāhādānapura (Palanpura) and built the Pāhavihara a Jain temple in that city.(x)

Appendix to chapter II

Stories about the Intercourse of Hemasuri and Kumārapāla

The Jain Chroniclers relate many stories describing Hemasuri's relations to his friend and pupil Kumārapāla. Most of these stories show Hemasuri's erudition his skilfulness in warding off the attack of envious Brahmins and his miraculous powers and Kumārapāla's devotion to Jainism. In a short work like this it is not possible to go into their details. But they are quoted here in brief for the sake of completion.

The first story related by Prabhācandra, the earliest chronicler informs us of a miraculous transformation of the ordinary palm-leaves into Śritāla leaves (*Prabhāvakācārita*, XXII 706-18). The second story in the *Prabhāvakācārita*

(W) Velankara No. 1773; Dvāl. loc. cit., pp. 242-3.

(X) Dvāl. loc. cit., p. 242.

shows how Kumārapāla showed his devotion to his 'guru' by making over his whole kingdom to him. The third story in the same work speaks about Hemasūri's power of prophecy (Ibid XXII, 765-70 and 699-705.).

The first story in the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (p. 205) shows how Hemasūri silenced Amiga by his cleverness in giving a reply. The second story in the same work (pp 205-6) relates how the learned Jain monk cleverly warded off the attack of a Brahmin. The third story of Merutunga relates how Hemasūri pleased the king by his clever reply. (*Prabandhachintāmaṇi*, p 206) The fourth story relates how the king was displeased with Viśveśvara who ridiculed Hemasūri and pleased with Ramachandra who fooled Viśveśvara. (Ibid, pp 226-7) The sixth story shows Hemasūri's humiliation in acknowledging his mistake. The seventh story shows that the king rewarded those who praised Hemasūri and punished those who censured him. The eighth and ninth stories show that those who praised Hemasūri pleased the king. The tenth story describes Hemasūri's relations to his preceptor Devasūri (Ibid , pp. 239-40) The eleventh story describes the past birth of Kumārapāla. The twelfth story says that Hemasūri cured the

king of leprosy (Ibid, p. 240 and 243-4). The thirteenth story shows Hemasūri's Yogic Powers (Ibid, p. 244).

To the stories of Prabhachandra and Merutunga, Ocharitrasundara adds a few more. The first story shows Kumārāpala's respect for Hemasūri. The second story shows that Devabodha could not work as a successful missionary at the court of Kumārāpala. The third story of Ocharitrasundara is a continuation of the second. The fourth story relates the practical difficulties which Kumārāpala encountered upon his conversion and the way in which Hemasūri solved them. The fifth and the sixth stories show Kumārāpala's generosity [*Kumārāpālācharita*, IV (i), 31-2 V (i, ii, iii) VIII, (i), 8 to 25]

Jayasūmhasūri and Rajasekhara have no new stories to tell. Jinamandana, however adds a few more. The first story shows Hemasūri's knowledge of music. The second story shows Hemasūri's sound knowledge of non-Jain Sastras. The third story tells us how Hemasūri proved that the sacrifices were unjust. The fourth story informs us that those who praised Hemasūri received rewards from Kumārāpala (*Kumārāpala Prabandha* pp 37 47-9).

Chapter III

Vastupāla-Tejahpāla



According to all authorities, Chandapa of the Prāgyāta race was the great grand-father of Vastupāla & Tejahpāla. He had a son named Chandaprasād who was a minister of a king of Gujarāt. Chandaprasād had a son named Soma who had no lord except Siddharāja and no God except Jineśvara. The latter had a son named Aśvarāja who was the father of Vastupāla and Tejahpāla.¹

The contemporary chroniclers do not say that Vastupāla and Tejahpāla were the sons of a widow, probably because widow-remarriages

¹ Arisimha, *Sukritasankīrtana*, III, 45-56, Jīna-vijaya, *Prāchīna Jaina Likhā Sangraha*, Nos 64, 65, *Bhavanagara Inscriptions* p 174; Udayaprabha, *Sukritakīrtihallolnī*, 98-117, Rajasekhara, *Chaturvimsatī-prabandha*, p. 107.

being rare in those days they would not have thought fit to hide their patrons with their low birth. The later chroniclers on the other hand, are unanimous on this point. According to them Haribhadrasūri a Jain monk once constantly looked at Kumāradevi a young widow of surpassing beauty while preaching in a monastery in Anahilavāda. One Aśvaraja who had observed this asked the sūri the reason of it at the end of the sermon Haribhadrasūri told him that the young widow was destined to be the mother of sons who would be like the sun and the moon of Jainism. Aśvaraja then, served the father of Kumāradevi. After some days he succeeded in winning the favour of Kumāradevi and married her. The latter gave birth to four sons—Vastupala Tejahpala, Luniga and Malladeva and seven daughters—Jalhu, Mānu Dhanadevi, Sohaga Sau Vayaju and Padmadevi.²

Several stories are related about Vastupala and Tejahpala coming to office. According to Someśvara the guardian deity of Gujarata once appeared to Lavanaprasada in a dream and

2. According to Merutunga Haribhadra constantly looked at Kumāradevi at the time of some religious ceremony and not while preaching. (*Prabandha-chintāmaṇi*—pp 251-2)

asked him to re-establish the glory of Gujarāta. Next morning, the king called his Purohita and told him the dream. The Purohita explained to him that it was an offer made to him by providence of the sovereignty of Gujarāta and that he should immediately establish his authority over the country which was at that time divided by powerful chiefs among themselves. The king then proposed to appoint some able minister to govern the country he had conquered. No sooner did this idea suggest to him than he thought of the two brothers Vastupala and Tejahpala and sent for them. The latter, accepting the invitation, went to the king and offering him presents, took their seats. The king, then, told them that he wanted to re-establish the glory of Gujarāta and for that purpose, required good ministers like them. Vastupala expressed his joy at the king's call to office, but told him that he would accept it only if the king promised to be just and to control his passions and not to lend his ears to back-biters. The king consenting, the two brothers accepted office.³

According to Arisimha, Kumārāpala appeared

3 *Kṛtīkaumudī*, II, 83-115 and III, 15-89, Kathavate's introduction to *Kṛtīkaumudī*, pp. XIII, XIV.

to Bhimadeva in a dream and asked him to leave the reins of Government in the hands of Lavanaprasada appoint his son Viradhavala as his Yuvaraja and to favour Jainism that had fallen into decay. Next morning the king made Lavanaprasada Sarvesvara or lord over all and his son Viradhavala Yuvaraja in open court. The latter then, demanded a good minister whereupon Bhimadeva asked the two minister-brothers Vastupala and Tejahpala who were in royal service to serve him and glorify the Jain faith⁴

According to Balachandrasūri the guardian deity of Gujarat, appeared to Viradhavala in a dream and asked him to appoint Vastupala and Tejahpala as his ministers. Viradhavala then sent for the two brothers who presented themselves before the king and paid their respects with presents. The king, being impressed by their good qualities asked them to accept the ministerial seal. Vastupala then declared their policy and upon the king's approving the same received the seal of the minister.

Jayasimhasūri says that Viradhavala once requested king Bhimadeva to give him a minister

4. Arisimba, *Subhitasambhitanā*, VI, 1-62. 5. Bāla-chandra Vasant-Vilas III, 51-42.

whereupon the latter gave him the two brothers Vastupāla and Tejahpāla who were working as his ministers.⁶

The story of the dream does not deserve consideration as it possesses poetic rather than historic truth. It is probable as Arisimha relates that Bhīma II made Lavanaprasāda Sarvesvara or Lord of All; for the *Lekhapanchāsika* contains two documents which support this view. One is about a gift of land. It bears the date V Samvat 1288. In it, Lavanaprasāda, the donor, is called Mahamandaleśvarādhipati or "The great overlord of feudatory princes." Before his name stands the whole genealogy of the Chaulukyas of Anahilavāda, and it is said that by the grace of his overlord Bhīma II, he possessed the Khetakapathaka or the Kaira District. This document clearly shows that Lavanaprasāda had not rebelled against his lord, otherwise he would not acknowledge Bhīma II as his master. It also shows that Lavanaprasāda had the power of making grants of land. The other document records an agreement of the same date between Mahamandaleśvara Rana Lavanaprasāda and Simhana, the Maharajadhiraja of Deogiri, in which

6 Jayasimhasūri, *Vastupāla-Tejahpāla Prasasti*, 39-52.

both the parties respectively promise to respect each other's boundaries to keep peace to help each other and to surrender each other's nobles who fled away with valuables. The date of the document is not to be taken as Samvat 1238 as all the documents in the work bear the same date but it shows that Lavanaprasāda enjoyed very wide powers and was authorized to make treaties with foreign powers in his own name. Other evidence also shows that Lavanaprasāda was really *Sarveśvara* for Merutunga describes him as *Bhūmadeva-rājyachintakari* or the premier or administrator of Bhūma.⁷ The appointment of Viradhavala as Yuvarāja is also probable as Bhīma II had no son. The other chroniclers do not mention this probably because it was without practical consequence as Viradhavala had died before Bhīma II.

When Lavanaprasāda and his son conducted themselves apparently at least as the vassals of Bhīmadeva II it is probable that the latter may have given them the ministers *Vastupala* and *Tojahpala* as *Arisimha*, supported by *Jayasimhasūri* and *Udayaprabhasūri* says. Moreover the stato-

⁷ *Prabandhaśaṅkṣamāṇi*, p. 250 8 *Ind. Ant.*, XXXI, 487

ment that Vastupāla gave out his policy before accepting office deserves full credence. It is also by no means incredible that the ministers entered into a contract with the Rana by which the latter was not to confiscate the wealth which they possessed even if he was displeased with them.⁹ The later chroniclers relate that Vastupāla was made the Governor of Stambhātirtha or Cambay and Tejahpala the prime minister. The statement deserves credence as we see Vastupāla as the Governor of Cambay in the *Kirtikaumudī* and other contemporary works. It is also corroborated by the Giranar inscription in which Vastupāla is described as Śarveśvara while Tejahpala as Mahamatya.¹⁰ The date of the commencement of the Vastupāla-Tejahpala ministry is given in the inscriptions as V Samvat 1276.¹¹

As the Governor of Cambay, Vastupāla ruled wisely and well. He redressed many wrongs committed by his predecessors in office. During his administration, the low people gave up earning money by unfair means, the wicked turned pale, the good prospered. All honestly

9 *Prabandhaśaṅkṛāntāmanī*, p. 252, Rajasekhara, *Chaturvimsatīprabandha*, pp. 108-9. 10 *Arch. Reports of Western India*, II p. 170. 11. *Ibid*, p. 170

carried on their business in security Prostitutes followed the right path.¹² Vastupala put an end to piracy planted groves of trees sunk wells, made public parks dug tanks and did many other works of public utility He treated all his subjects equally¹³

The later chronicles relate that Vastupala had, on coming to office exacted twenty-one (f) lacs as fine from a wicked old officer and with the money so obtained kept an army He had also compelled the heads of five hundred villages in the vicinity of Dholaka to pay tribute from which they had claimed exemption for many years¹⁴

Vastupala was not only a financier but also a warrior and statesman. He defeated Sankha of Broach in battle¹⁵ and formed friendship with Altamash king of Delhi by giving very good treatment to his mother or preceptor¹⁶

According to the *Chaturvimsatiprabandha* Tejapala defeated the king of Godhra and exacted heavy fine from him. His services were

12. This is a poetic way of describing good administration. 13 *Kirtikamundi* IV 9 to 41, Kathavata's introduction, p. XIV 14 Rajasekhara, *Chaturvimsatiprabandha*, p. 110 15 Somesvara, *Kirtikamundi* V 7-63 16 Bālabhadra, *Vasudāyāna* VI 109

appreciated by Viradhavala who rewarded him with presents¹⁷ This victory of Tejahpala is not confirmed by the contemporary chroniclers

According to the *Vastupālaśharita*, Visaladeva had a maternal uncle named Sinha Once the latter beat a Jain monk for a trivial offence When Vastupāla came to know this, he asked his man to cut off the hand of Sinha The latter patiently bore grudge and once instigated Visaladeva But Someśvara brought about a conciliation between Visaladeva and Vastupāla. On another occasion, when a pratihara named Samara instigated the king, Someśvara again took the side of the minister and appeased the king¹⁸ These stories are not recorded by the earlier chroniclers This, however, need not lead us to reject them entirely. They are all right in so far as they show the relations of Vastupāla and Someśvara

Narachandra, Vastupāla's preceptor, had told Vastupāla that he would die in V Samvat 1296; so Vastupāla called his relatives and gave out his intention of making a pilgrimage to Śatrunjaya. The relatives consenting, he started for Śatrunjaya,

17 Bajasekhara, *Chaturvimsatīprabandha*, 114-5

18 Jinaharsha, *Vastupalāśharita*, pp 295-8

but could not reach the holy hill. He died on the way in V Samvat 1296 (A. D. 1239-40) and his body was taken to the holy hill and burnt near it. Tejapala erected a temple where his brother was burnt. When Visaladeva came to know of Vastupala's death he was much grieved. He made Jajrasimha son of Vastupala, Lord of Petalada in appreciation of his father's services.¹⁰

The eleventh canto of the *Sukrtasamuktikā* describes the pious and religious deeds of Vastupala as follows:—

(1) The restoration of the Temple of Panchasara Parāvanatha of Vanaraja in Anahila vada.

In Stambhatirtha or Cambay:—

(2) The erection of a golden staff and knob on the temple of Bhimesa (v 3).

(3) The erection of an Uttanpatta before Bhattaditya and of a golden wreath on his head. (v 4).

(4) Excavation of a well in the temple grove called Vahaka of Bhattaraka (v 5)

¹⁰ Ibid, pp. 301-3. Jinabhartha's statement that Vastupala died in 1296 does not deserve credence.

(5) The erection of a vestibule before the temple of the Sun-God Bakula (v. 6).

(6) The restoration of the vestibule and the temple of Vaidyanatha (v. 7)

(7) The erection of high-walled enclosures for the sale of whey to avoid contamination (v. 8).

(8) The erection of two Upasrayas (monasteries or nunneries) (v. 9)

(9) The erection of a ' parabadi ' (a place for drinking water) (v. 10)

(10) The erection of a temple to Ādinātha, the first Tirthankara of the Jains (v. 11).

(11) The erection of two Upasrayas (v. 12)

(12) The restoration of a Śiva temple (v. 13)

(13) The excavation of a well (v. 13).

(14) The erection of a pump-room (v. 14)

on the holy hill Śatrunjaya:—

(15) The erection of an " Indramandapa " before the temple of Ādinātha (v. 15)

(16) The erection of the temples of Neminātha and Parśvanātha (v. 16)

(17) The erection of a statue of Sarasvatī, the goddess of learning (v. 17).

(18) The erection of sculpture representing four summits of Mt Giranara (v 20)

(19) The construction of a Torana or arch before the temple of Ādinatha (v 21)

(20) The erection of temples to Munisuvrata swami, the twentieth and Mahaviraswami, the last tirthankara of the Jains (v 22)

(21) The construction of a tablet of gold and precious stones behind the image of Ādinatha. (v 23)

(22) The preparation of a golden arch (v 24)

In the vicinity of Padaliptapura
or Palltana—

(23) The excavation of a large tank. (v 26)

(24) The erection of an Upasraya or Poshadbasala. (v 27)

(25) The erection of a pump room. (v 28)

In the village Arkapallta or Ankevaliya.—

(26) The excavation of a tank. (v 29)

On Mt Giranara:—

(27) The erection of two temples to Parīvanatha and Ādinatha.

In Stambhana (Probably Thamana near Umreth in the Kaira District.)

(28) The restoration of the temple to Parśvanātha. (v 31)

(29) The erection of two pump rooms (v 32).

In Darbhāvati or Dabhoi (in the Baroda District)

(30) The placing of 19 golden capitals on the temple of Vaidyanātha and the erection of an image of sun-God (v. 33).

On Mt. Abu

(31) The building of a niche of Malladeva (in Samvat 1274) for the religious merits of the spirit of his elder brother Malladeva (v. 34).

The *Kīrtikaumudī* which does not enumerate all the pious deeds of Vastupāla confirms some of the details of Arisimha. The *Vasantavilāsa* says that the number of religious places, temples, upāśrayas, dwelling places for the Brahmīns and tanks erected and sunk by Vastupāla in each city, town, village and mountain is such as baffles the attempt to count²⁰. The *Tīrthakalpa* and the *Chaturvīṃśatīprabandha* say that Vastupāla and Tejapāla set up one hundred and

20 Bālachandra, *Vasantavilāsa* p IV

twenty-five thousand Jain images spent 18 crore and ninety-six lacs, on Satrunjaya, twelve crore and eighty lacs on Ujjayanta or Giranara twelve crore and fifty lacs on Arbuda or Mt. Abu and erected 984 Poshadhashtalas 500 Smavasaranas, 700, alma-houses, etc.⁽²¹⁾

According to the *Vastupālācharitā* Vastupala and Tejhapala; built 1313 new Jain temples, repaired 3300 old; Jain temples made 1, 25 000 Jain idols and 100,000 Sivalingas built 3200 non-Jain temples 984 inns, 701, hermitages 700 alma-houses 30 forts 84 lakes, 464 step-wells 100 bhandaras 400 water-rooms 80 toranas and gave annuities to 1 000 hermits and 4024 workers.⁽²²⁾

Quoting another authority the same writer gives the following account of the pious and religious deeds of Vastupala and Tejhapala -

Vastupala and Tejhapala built 700 alma-houses 64 step-wells, hundreds of Jain monasteries and nunneries many hermitages and 500 pathashalas or schools. Every year they worshipped the Jain Sangha thrice. For the worship of the

(21) Rajasekhara, *Chaturvimsatiprabandha*, p 133-
Vastupala *Naravarṇyaśataka*, p V

(22) *Vastupālācharitā*, p p. 305-6

Jinēśvara, they gave countless stools, 'kalasās, or water-pots and' simhasānas to Jain temples²³

The same writer says that in Āśāpallī, Vastupāla set up the images of Viraprabhu and Santinātha for the spiritual welfare of his son. In the same town, he also set up the images of the principal deities in the temples of Santu and Vayatiya. Tejahpāla set up the image of the 'Mūlanayaka' or the principal deity in the Jain temple at Tharāpadra. In the village Umarasiḡ, he built a water-room and an inn. At Serisā, near Kalol (North Gujarat), he set up the images of Neminātha and Mahāvira in the temple of Pārśvanātha. At Vijapur, he placed gold knobs on the temples of Mahāvira and Ādinātha. On the Taranga hill, he set up the images of Ādinātha and Neminātha in Kumārāpālā's temple. In his native place, he repaired all Jain and non-Jain temples. In Māṇḍal, he built a temple to Ādinātha. At Anahilapātana, he set up the image of 'Mūlanayaka' in the temple of Panchāsārā Pārśvanātha. In Bhīmāpallī, he built a chariot to take out the images of Jina in the public. At Prahlādanapura or Pālānapura and Chandrāvati, he built two Jain temples. In the Jain temples of Avanti and Nāsik, he set up the images of Tirthankaras.

In Khadirālaya he built the temples of Ādinatha and Mahāvira. In Jhavarat, he built a temple of Neminatha and in Sankhapura, one of Santinatha. In fine, the two brothers built so many gardens water-rooms lakes temples alms-houses and sunk so many wells and step-wells that it is impossible to count them."

The details of Arisimha given above deserve credence as they come from a contemporary whose main object was to enumerate the pious and religious deeds of Vastupāla. Some of the details of the later chroniclers are confirmed by the earlier and contemporary chroniclers but as to the rest, it is difficult to say anything with certainty. From the works of the contemporary as well as later chroniclers we can however say with certainty that the two brothers (Vastupāla and Tejapāla) were great donors that they built many Jain temples and a few non-Jain temples set up many images of Tirthankaras adorned Jain temples with gold staffs and knobs built many monasteries sunk many wells and step-wells excavated tanks built water-rooms constructed arches maintained libraries erected inns and repaired many Jain temples. To-day we see only a few of the works of the two

ministers but they have made their names immortal by erecting a temple to Neminatha on Mt Abu.

Lunigavasahi, about which more is said hereafter, is a temple of which Gujarāta can justly be proud. It has attracted visitors from far off places.

Lunavasahi or Tejahpāla's Temple on Mt. Abu.

According to Rajasekhara, Vastupāla hearing the account of Vimala who had erected the famous temple on Mt Abu, formed a desire to build a similar temple on that mountain for the good of Luniga's soul. Tejahpāla liked this idea and went to Chandrāvati. Dhāravarsha, king of Chandrāvati, accompanied him to Mt Abu. Selecting a site for the temple, he went to Ārāsana and arranged for the stones. Then he appointed Śobhanadeva, an architect, and Udala to superintend the erection of the temple with full powers to spend money freely, and went to Dholaka. Many architects were employed to prepare the images of Tirthankaras. Once Udala complained to Tejahpāla that the architects demanded salary in advance. Tejahpāla who was bent upon erecting the temple at any cost, permitted him to grant the architects' demand. When the inner

part of the temple was completed, and the image of Nemīnātha set up in it, the good news was sent to the ministers at Dholakā. Tejapala then went to Abu with Anupamadevi and worshipped the image of Nemīnātha.¹

In Samvat 1287 or A. D. 1231 when the temple was complete Vastupala made a pilgrimage to Mt. Abu in the company of Yaśovīra, an artist. The latter told Vastupala that though Śobhansdeva was a good architect he had committed several mistakes. In the painted vestibule, the broad passage between the two statues was altogether inappropriate in a temple of a Tīrthankara and was forbidden by the treatises on architecture the arch over the door that led into the inner cell of the temple disturbed the worship of the Jīvesvara on account of the two lions on it; the *hastāśala* (elephant room) adorned with the statues of the ancestors was fatal to the long life of the men who built the temple and the images of Jina on the pillars in the temple were likely to be defiled.² These small defects pointed out by Yaśovīra however

(1) Rajasekhara, *Chaturvīṃśatīprabandha*, p. 139-43

(2) Rajasekhara, *Loc. cit.*, p. 132. Merutunga, *Prabandhaśāhityam*, p. 259-60.

do not count much in the eyes of the modern artists who aptly call the temple a triumph of art

The plan of this temple was undoubtedly suggested by that of Vimala Shah, and the architectural features are similar to those of the other temple. The chief objects of interest are the dome, the hastisala and beautiful carving on pillars and bells

The dome stands on eight pillars which are somewhat higher than those that support the dome of Vimala Shah's temple. It is a magnificent piece of work, and has a pendant that is a perfect gem. "Where it drops from the ceiling, it appears like a cluster of the half-disclosed lotus whose cups are so thin, so transparent and so accurately wrought that it fixed the eyes in admiration" "It hangs from the centre more like a lustre on crystal drops than a solid mass of marble" It is finished "with a delicacy of detail and appropriateness of ornaments which is probably unsurpassed by any similar example to be found anywhere else. Those introduced by Gothic architects in Henry VII's Chapel at Westminster or at Oxford are coarse and clumsy in comparison"

The garbhagriha contains a colossal black

image of Neminatha, the twenty-second Tirthankara, besides several images of other Tirthankaras. This image was set up by Pethad Shah when the one set up by Tejahpala was demolished by the Mussalmans about Samvat 1868 or A. D. 1811-12.*

The *hastisala* or elephant room of this temple is much larger than that of Vimala Shah's and was undoubtedly suggested by the latter for we do not find such elephant rooms in many Jain temples. In the centre there is an image of Ādinatha the first Tirthankara and in front of it, there is a representation of Mt. Meru containing twelve images in black stone. Moreover there are ten very well-moulded marble elephants. "The delicacy of work on their trappings is marvellous ropes as well as ornamental hangings being worked with extraordinary care. Formerly all the elephants were mounted but the figures seem to have been demolished by iconoclasts. Some elephants seem to have been subsequently repaired. Behind the elephants there are ten slabs with statues of Vastupala and Tejahpala and their relatives. On the first slab we find the statues of the Jain

(*) Jinavijaya *Prākṛika Jain Lekha Sangraha*, App., p. 137

monks Udayaprabhasūri and his guru Vijayasena who performed the ceremony of setting up the flag and the finial on this temple, besides those of Chandapa and Chapaladevī, the great grandfather and great grand-mother of Vastupāla and Tejahpāla. The second slab contains the statues of Chandaprasāda, the son of Chandapa and his wife. On the third slab, there are statues of Soma, Chandaprasāda's son, and his wife Sitādevī. The fourth slab contains the figures of Āsarāja and Kumāradevī, the parents of Vastupāla and Tejahpāla. The fifth slab contains the figures of Luniga, the elder brother of Vastupāla and Tejahpāla and his wife Lilādevī. On the sixth slab, we find the statues of Malladeva, second brother of Vastupāla and Tejahpāla and his two wives Lilādevī and Pratāpadevī. On the seventh slab, we see Vastupāla with his two wives Lalitadevī and Vejaladevī. On the eighth is seen Tejahpāla with his wife Anupamadevī. On the ninth, there are statues of Jaitrasimha, son of Vastupāla by his wife Lalitadevī, with his three wives Jetalde, Jemalde and Rupānde. There are no materials of worship in the hands of Vijayasena and Udayaprabha because the Jain monks are not allowed to do 'dravyapuja' i.e. they do not worship Jineśvara with materials of worship. All the

other statues of men and women are seen with materials of worship in hand. In fine the elephant room contains fifteen images of Jina two figures of Jain monks ten of śravakas fifteen of śrāvikas and ten elephants

Like the temple of Vimala Shah this temple contains about forty-seven cells in which the images of one or more Tirthankaras are set up. In cell number one there is an image of Ambika devi. In cell number nine there is an image of Neminnatha and a scene from Neminnatha's life after his renunciation. In cell number eleven, there is a scene of Neminnatha's marriage. In cell number fourteen there is a scene from the life of Śantinatha the 16th Tirthankara. In cell number thirty-two there are four beautifully carved images of goddesses

Besides these scenes we find several scenes from the life of Krishna as well as pictures of animate and inanimate objects in various parts of the temple. One thing we must not fail to note is the niches popularly known to be built by the wives of Vastupala and Tejāhpala. In reality they were built by Tejāhpala for the good of his wife Suhadadevi's soul. They are beautifully carved. In them, there are images of Jinas Jain monks men birds and beasts

This temple contains in all one hundred and thirty pillars of which thirty-eight are beautifully carved⁴

Near Lunavasahī, there is an inscription of Kumbhārānā. It is carved at the foot of a Kirtistambha or pillar of victory and bears the date V S 1506 or A D 1449-50. It says that pilgrims to Lunavasahī and Vimalavasahī should not be taxed directly or indirectly.

Vastupāla's temple on Girānāra is situated to the south of Sampratī Rājā's temple. From an inscription of V S. 1932 (A.D. 1875-6), it is clear that the temple was repaired by Naraśi Keshavaji. This is a triple temple. The central one has two finely carved domes which are not well-preserved. It is dedicated to Mallinātha, the nineteenth Tirthankara. The 'ranga-mandapa' or hall is 29½ ft broad and 53 ft long. The 'garbhagriha' or 'gabharo' containing the images of Tirthankaras is 13' by 13'.

To the left of the central temple, there is a small temple containing three images of Pārśvanātha and one of Chandraprabhu. The temple contains two inscriptions of V S 1485 and V S. 1556 (or A D 1429 and 1500).

(4) Jayantavijaya, *Abu*, p. 126

To the right of the central temple there is another small temple in which there are two images of Suparsvanatha one of Neminatha and one of Chandraprabhu. From an inscription it is clear that three out of four images were set up in V S 1546 (A. D 1490).

Besides erecting temples to Tirthankaras Vastupala showed his great devotion to Jina by making 13 pilgrimages to Śatrunjaya Giranara and the other holy places of the Jains. In an inscription of his it is said that in V S 1249 (A. D 1192-3), he made a pilgrimage to Śatrunjaya and Giranara with his father Āsaraṇa who was a Sanghapati or the leader of the congregation. In the following year i. e V S 1250 (A. D 1193-4) he again went to Śatrunjaya and Giranara in the company of his father. In V S 1277 (A. D 1220-21) Vastupala became a Sanghavi and went to Giranara Devapattana and Śatrunjaya with his family and Jain congregation in dignity and pomp. In V S 1290 (A. D 1233-4) V S. 1291 (A. D 1234-5) and V S 1293 (A. D 1236-37) he went to Śatrunjaya and Giranara in the company of his family and retinue. He again made seven pilgrimages to Śatrunjaya in the years V

(5) Ankharya V H. *Kṛtikomandī* (Guj.), introduction p. 35.

S 1284, 1285, 1286, 1287, 1288 and 1289 with his family. In V. S. 1296, he died, on the way, before reaching the holy hill (Śatrunjaya).

We shall now deal with the literary activities in what is aptly called the Vastu-Teja yuga in Jain Literature. Many a time, we find that the patrons of learning and the learned are not learned. Vastupāla, on the other hand, was a poet and patron of the learned and passed his leisure hours in their company. He had won the birudas 'Kavikunja', 'Kavichakravartī', 'Mahākavi' and 'Laghubhojārāja'. He was the author of the *Naranārāyanānanda*, *Adyameśvara stotra*, *Āmbikāstāvana* and many short poems. He founded three 'gnāna-bhaṇḍāras' or libraries at a very great cost. Unfortunately, his 'bhaṇḍāras' seem to have been destroyed by the Muslims.

Among the poets patronized by Vastupāla was Someśvara, a Brahmin. He was a Purohita of the Anahilavāḍa King. His ancestors also held the same office. His *Kīrtīkaumudī* gives us valuable information about the history of Gujarāṭa and about the pious and religious deeds of Vastupāla. His other works are the *Surathotsava*,

(1) *Jaina Yuga*, pp. 82, Desai, *Jain Sahitya-Itihāsa*, p. 370-71

the *Ramakataka* the *Ullasarāghava* and the *Prastāsi* to the temples of Vastupala and Tejapala on Mt. Abu and Giranara. He is also said to have composed a *Prastāsi* to the temple of Viranarayana in Anahilavada.²

Harihara was another poet patronized by Vastupala. He was a Brahmin of Gaudadeśa and found favour at the court of Viradhavala in spite of the jealousy of Someśvara. Later on a conciliation between the two learned men was effected by Vastupala. Rajasekharasūri devotes the twelfth chapter of the *Chaturvīṃśatīprabandha* to this poet.³

Subhata is known as the author of the *Dutāgada* a drama in one act. Someśvara bestows high praise on him. Subhata's other works are not known. He was a non-Jain.

Nanaka was another poet patronized by Vastupala. He was a Nagar Brahmin of Vadanagara and was proficient in six vedas. He had poetic skill but unfortunately no work of his is handed down to us.⁴

Arisimha son of Lavanasimha was another poet patronized by Vastupala. He is known as

(2) Rajasekharasūri, *Chaturvīṃśatīprabandha*, p.p. 66. (3) *Ibid*, p.p. 64-7

(4) *Jaina Yuga*, V p 84. (5) *Ibid*, p 84.

the author of the *Sukṛita-Saṅkīrtana*, a work, in eleven cantos, containing valuable information, about the history of Gujaraṭa, and describing important pious and religious works of Vastupāla. He was a follower of Jina or Siva.

Amarachandrasūri, pupil of Jinadattasūri, was the author of the *Chaturvīṃśatījnacharita*, or the *Padmānandābhyudaya*, the *Bālabbhārata*, the *Kāvya-kalpalatāparimāla*, the *Kavīkalpalatā*, *Kavī-sikhāvrīṭṭi*, *Alankāraprabodha* *Chhandoratnāvalī*, *Suktāvalī* and *Kalākalāpa*. He was very popular among the Jains as well as non-Jains and composed poems on the spur of the moment. He found favour at the court of Viśaladeva.

Balachandrasūri was a Brahmin of Modheraka (modern Modhera, in the Mehsana District). His father's name was Dhurādeva and mother's name Vidyut. Before he entered the order of Jain monks, he was known as Munjāla and trained by Rājaguru Padmāditya. Once he heard a sermon of Haribhadrasūri and cultivated regard for Jainism. After some training, he entered the order of Jain monks with the consent of his father and came to be known as Balachandra. In the

(6) Bhandarakara, IV, 6, Velanakara, Nos. 60, 131 and 1759, Buhler, IV, No. 287.

Upadeśakandalavṛtti he gives the following account of his spiritual descent —

(1) Pradyumnasūri of Chandragatohha (2) Chandraprabhusūri (3) Dhaneśvarasūri (4) Devendrasūri (5) Bhadrēśvarasūri (6) Abhayadevasūri (7) Haribhadrasūri and (8) Balachandrasūri—our author

He is known to have composed the *Karṇa-vajrāyudha* a drama in five acts commentaries on Āśada's *Vṛkṣamānjari* and *Upadeśakandal* and the *Vasantavīḍa*. The last work contains valuable information about the history of Gujarat and the exploits of Vastupala. It was written after the death of Vastupala and was mainly meant for Jaltrasimha Vastupala's son, whom the author wanted to console. Our author was on good terms with Udayasūri, an Ācharya of Devasūrigatohha who gave him the Sarasvatamantra. In the *Vasantavīḍa* Balachandrasūri calls himself "Vāgdevipratipannasūni" or the adopted son of the goddess of learning.

Jayasimhasūri, pupil of Virasūri was an Ācharya in the temple of Munisuvrataswami of Broach. At his suggestion, Vastupala and Tejah

(7) Desai, *Leo Ott*, p. 232; Hiralal Hansaraj *loc. cit.*, p. 23.

pāla gave 25 gold staffs for the devakulikās in Śakunīkavihāra, a Jain temple, built by Ambada in Broach.⁸ To commemorate this event, Jaysimhasūri composed the Vastupāla-Tejhapāla Praśasti between A. D. 1220 and 1230. The Praśasti contains valuable information about the kings of Gujarāta from Mularaja to Bhīma II, as well as about the latter's Vaghela ministers, praises Vastupāla and Tejhapāla for their pious and religious deeds and gives their genealogy. The *Hamīramadamardana* is another work of Jaysimhasūri. It is a Sanskrit drama in five acts dramatizing the repulsion of a Muslim attack on Gujarāta. It was composed between A. D. 1220 and 1230 and was first staged at Cambay at the command of Jayantasimha, Vastupāla's son, in A. D. 1230.

Udayaprabhasūri was a pupil of Vijayasena-sūri who was the spiritual preceptor of Vastupāla and Tejhapāla. He is known to have composed (1) the *Dharmābhyudayamahākāvya*, a poetical work containing historical information about Vastupāla, his preceptor and other Jain monks; (2) The *Ārambhasiddhi*, a work on astrology; (3) *Nemināthacharita* in Sanskrit (4-5) Commentaries

(8) Desai, Loc. cit., p. 385

on the *Shadāhita* and *Karmastava* works on the Karma philosophy; and (6) a Commentary on the *Upadesandha* of Dharmadasagani in V S 1399 (A. D. 1248) in Dholakā.⁹

Devaprabhasūri, guru of Narachandrasūri, was the author of the *Pāṇḍavacharitamahātāya*, the *Dharmasārasa* or the *Hṛghavacharita* and the *Anargharāghava kāvyādhara*.¹⁰

Narachandrasūri pupil of Devaprabhasūri of Harshapuriyagatchha, accompanied Vastupala in his pilgrimages to the holy places and composed the *Katharāghava* at the minister's request. His other works are the commentaries on the *Anargharāghava* of Mārari and the *Nyāyabandha* of Śrīdhara *Jyotiḥsāra Dipikāprabodha* and the *Chaturvimsatyajñastotra*.¹¹

Narendraprabhasūri, pupil of Narachandrasūri of Harshapuriyagatchha, composed the *Alankāramahodadhī* for Vastupala at the command of Narachandrasūri. He is also known as the author of the *Katutsthakela*.¹²

(9) Peterson II 33 and III 16; Desai, Loc. cit., p. 386.

(10) Peterson III 132, 275; Velanākara, No. 1745; *Jesalmere Catalogue* p. 52.

(11) *Jesalmere* No. 220; Velanākara No. 211; Peterson V 46 and III, 272-3.

(12) Desai Loc. cit., pp. 233-9.

Gunavallabha composed the *Chatushkāvachuri* at the command of Narachandrasūri of Harshapuriyagatohha in V. S. 1271 (A. D 1215)¹³

Vinayachandra^{13A} was the author of the *Mallicharita*. He corrected Udayasimha's commentary on the *Dharmavidhi* in V. S. 1286 (A D 1230) He used the word Vinaya as the distinguishing mark of his poems¹⁴

Vijayachandrasūri was a pupil of Devendrasūri. He indirectly helped the spread of literature by persuading some Jains to get written a copy of the *Langānusāsana* of Vāmanāchārya in V S. 1287 (A. D 1231).¹⁵

Bhuvanachandra wrote a tippana on the *Sabdanusāsana* of Hemachandrasūri.¹⁶

Jinapāla, pupil of Jinapatisūri of Kharatara-gatohha was the author of the *Dwādasakulakavivarana* in A D. 1237, the *Shatssthānakavrittī* in

(13) Ibid, p. 388

13A This Vinayachandra was probably the author of the *Pārsvanāthacharita* and many other prabandhās. His *Kavisikhā* can be seen to-day in the Pātana Bhandāra, He flourished about V. S 1285

(14) Peterson, V, pp 30 and 115.

(15) Peterson, III, app 114

(16) Peterson, V, p. XLIX

A. D. 1296 the *Panchalinggavaratanatippanam* in A. D. 1287 the *Upadesarasthyana* in A. D. 1288 the *Characharavritta*, the *Sanatkumāracharita*, the *Swapnachhara* the *Ashtasvapnabhdhaya* and other works.¹⁷

Padmaprabhasūri, pupil of Vibodhasūri of Chandragatohha composed the *Munuswaratacharita* in V S. 1294 (A. D. 1238) and the *Kunthucharita*. It is not known whether this Padmaprabha or some other monk was the author of the *Bhuvanadipaka* and other works.¹⁸

Mahendrasūri was a pupil of Dharmaghosha sūri of Anchalagatohha and the preceptor of Simhaprabha. He revised and in part rewrote the *Septapadi* of Dharmaghosha in A. D. 1288 The *Tirthamala stotra-Pratima Stuti* in Prakrit was his work. The *Jirdvals-Pārsvanāthacharita* was probably written by this poet. His dates are birth A. D. 1172, diksha, Samvat 1237 (A. D. 1181), Acharya-Samvat 1263 (A. D. 1207) and death V S. 1309 (A. D. 1258) A pupil of Mahendra probably wrote the *Ukshakharanāvachari*.¹⁹

(17) *Jewellers Catalogue* No. 21A and introduction p. 41.

(18) Hiralal Hansaraja, *Jain Itihasa*, I, p. 72.

(19) Peterson, III, app. p. 220; I app. p. 12; IV p. LXXXIX; Hiralal Hansaraja *Jain Itihasa*, p. 92.

Guṇākara was the author of a commentary on the *Yogarātnamāla* in V S 1296 (A.D. 1240)²⁰

Devendrasūri, pupil of Chandrasūri of Chandra-gachha wrote the *Upamatiḥbhavaprapanchakathā-sāroddhāra* in V S 1298 (A D. 1242).

Abhayadevasūri,^{21A} pupil of Padmendu, was the author of the *Jayantavigayakāvya* in V. S 1278 (A D 1222) The following is the account of his spiritual descent .—

(1) Vardhamānasūri (2) Jineśvara (3) Abhayadeva Navāṅgīvṛttikāra (4) Jinavallabha (5) Jinasekhara (6) Padmendu (7) Abhayadevasūri II—our author.

Jagatchandrasūri performed austere penance in V. S 1285 (A D 1229); so Jaitrasīmha, king of Mewad, gave him the biruda “tapā”. He was the founder of the “Tapā” gachha Vastupāla honoured Jagatchandra and his pupils This is the reason why the monks of Tapa gachha wield great influence in Gujarata even to-day²²

Vastupāla died in V. S. 1296 (A. D 1239-40) and Tejahpāla in V S 1304 (A D 1247-8) They

(20) Peterson, II, app p 330 and IV, p XXVI,
(21A) (21) Desai, Loc cit, pp 392-3, p. 397, (22)
Ibid, p 396.

held the reins of government from V S. 1276 (A. D 1219-20) till death. They used their intelligence and power in carrying out a small kingdom for their Rana whom they served very faithfully. They pursued a vigorous foreign policy and raised the honour of Gujarat. They were popular among the classes and masses. Though they were very staunch Jains, they did encourage other religions. They were great patrons of art and architecture as well as learning and the learned. They were ministers of whom Gujarat can justly be proud.

Chapter IV.

Jainism

in

The Vāghelā Period

After Vastupāla and Tejapāla, Jagadu Shah, a Jain Bania of Cutch, continued their work by erecting temples to Tirthankaras, making pilgrimages to the holy places of the Jains, improving the condition of the Srāvakas and Srāvikas and patronizing the learned. But his title to fame rests on the "glorious and meritorious services" he rendered to humanity during the famine of V. S. 1315 (A. D. 1258-9). He believed that 'service of man is service of God', so he served the 'children of God' without making any distinction of race, religion, language, caste or creed. In this work, he was encouraged by Paramadevasūri, a Jain monk.

Viyadu, a Srimali Jain Bania, was the ancestor of Jagadu. He was an orthodox Jain and built

many Jain temples sunk wells and performed many religious deeds. He had a son named Varanaga who lived in Kanthakota in Cutch. Varanaga had a son named Vana. The latter had five sons—Vasala, Viradeva, Nirmala, Nemi, Chanila and Shrivata. Vana's oldest son Vasala had four sons—Lakala, Sulakalana, Sola and Solil. Sola made Ilhadravara his domello of choice and married Lakalmi who gave birth to three sons—Jagadu, Raja and Padma. Jagadu had a wife named Yasmati and a daughter named Pritimati. When Pritimati became a widow Jagadu wanted to give her in marriage again, but could not do so as widow re-marriages were uncommon in those days.¹ Jagadu had no son, but his brother Raja who had married Rajalodori had two sons named Vikramasilaha and Dhandhu and a daughter named Manal or Mansabai.²

Once Jagadu purchased a goat on the neck of which was tied a precious Jewel and became very rich. On another occasion his servant Jayantasilaha purchased a stone from the king of Ormuz. This stone which contained many precious jewels made Jagadu very rich.³ In other

(1) Harvāṇanilāṭī *Jagadśakuntla* I and II, 81

(2) *Ibid*, II 20-22.

(3) *Ibid* III 22-3.

words, Śarvanandasūri informs us that fortune smiled upon Jagadu and the latter became very rich without any great effort on his part

Pithadeva of Parakara demolished the fortifications of Bhadreśvara, so Jagadu began to rebuild the fort Pithadeva asked him not to do so, but Jagadu completed the fort with the help of Lavanaprasāda⁵

Once Paramadevasūri paid a visit to Bhadreśvara and put up at the place of Jagadu. At the Sūri's suggestion, Jagadu made up his mind to make a pilgrimage to Giranara and Śatrunjaya with the Jain Sangh. To get protection for the congregation, he saw Viśaladeva in Anahilavāda, pleased him with presents and returned to Bhadreśvara to start for the holy places in the company of the Jain congregation. The congregation which started on an auspicious day fixed by Paramadevasūri, safely reached the holy places. On the way, Jagadu gave much money to the poor and set up flags on many Jain temples⁶

Once Paramadevasūri called Jagadu and told

(4) Ibid, III, 11 to 18 and IV,

(5) Ibid V. This Pithadeva was probably Patha (A. D. 1197 to 1230) of Parakara.

(6) Ibid, VI, 10 to 41.

him that there would be a great famine in V S 1813 1814 and 1815 and so he should store as much corn as he could in all the countries. Jagadu acted according to the advice of his spiritual preceptor and stored much corn in many places. In his granaries he put copperplates containing the words "This is meant for the poor." In the days of famine he opened 112 alms-houses and distributed 49950000⁷ man corn costing about about Rs 450 00000

In the third Year of famine the prices of corn had soared very high and even the granaries of the kings were empty so Jagadu gave 400 000 mans of corn to Vīśaladeva king of Anahilavada, 600 000 mans to the king of Sind, 1600 000⁸ mans to king of Mewad, 900 000 mans to king of Malwa 1600 000 mans to king of Benaras and 1050 000 mans to Nasiruddin^{8a} Emperor of Delhi.⁹

These details of Sarvanandasūri are not confirmed by contemporary evidence. This however need not lead us to reject them. The names of the kings and mandalesāvaras of Gajarat that we find in the *Jagadacharita* are confirmed by

(7-8) Ibid VI, 63 to 132.

(8A) This Nasiruddin (1346 to 1366 A. D.) was certainly a contemporary of Jagadu Shah.

contemporary evidence. Viśaladeva was, beyond doubt, the king of Gujarata when the famine occurred. According to Sarvaṇandasūri, the famine raged from V. S 1313 to 15, while according to Subhasila, it occurred during the Years V S 1315-17. From both the accounts, it is clear that the famine lasted for three years. There may or may not be exaggeration about the amount of corn distributed by Jagadu, but certain it is that he opened alms-houses in various parts of the country, gave corn to the poor very liberally and helped Viśaladeva of Anahilavāda and other kings of India by giving them corn in the days of famine.

The following were the other pious and religious deeds of Jagadu? —

(1) Adorned the temple of Viranatha in Bhadreśvara with a gold knob and a gold staff.

(2) Built a temple containing images of 24 Tirthankaras in Bhadreśvara

(3) Set up 170 images of Jina

(4) Gave a gold covering for the image of Parśvanatha in the same place

(5) Repaired the tanks of Kumārāpala and

(9) Ibid, VI, 42 to 66

Mularaja and the step-well of Karna in Bhadravara.

(6) Made a garden for supplying flowers for the worship of Jina.

(7) Built a temple to Ādinatha at Dhanka (modern Dhanka about 22 miles from Porbandara in Saurashtra)

(8) Built a temple to 24 Trithankara at Vardhamana (modern Wadhawana in Saurashtra).

(9) Repaired the Temple of Harishankara at Kunnaria a village to the north of Onch.

(10) Set up an image of Viranatha in Wadhawan.

(11) Built a temple to Santinatha at Devakula near Sulakshanapura.

(12) Built a Poshadhasala or a monastery at Bhadravara.

(13) Built a mosque at Bhadravara.

(14) Made three pilgrimages to Ghanara and Satrunjaya

(15) Held a festival when the dignity of Ācharya was conferred on Shishena, a pupil of Paramadevasūri.

(16) Dug wells in many villages and towns.

Several stories are told about Jagadu. Most of them show that Fortune had smiled upon him or that he was the 'adopted son of Fortune' and was therefore able to spend money freely. Ratnamandiraganī tells a tale which shows Jagadu's relations to Viśaladeva of Anāhilavada. Jagadu was a very broad-minded man. He did not want to put any body to shame, so he sat behind a curtain and gave charity to a person when the latter held out his hand. Once, so the story goes, Viśaladeva changed his dress and went to Jagadu Shah for alms. From the marks on the hand, Jagadu Shah saw that the person wishing to receive alms was a great man whose riches had taken wings, so he gave his two very precious rings in order that he might not be overtaken by a storm of misfortune during his lifetime. Next day, Viśaladeva sent for Jagadu Shah, returned his two rings and highly honoured him¹⁰

According to the second story, Jagadu had obtained name and fame by opening many alms-houses. Viśaladeva, growing jealous of Jagadu's fame, opened a kitchen in Anāhilavada where he served oil to the people, but he could not do so

for a long time so Jagadu took up his work and began to serve ghee to the people

The stories quoted above show that Jagadu was a great donor whose resources were almost unlimited and that he was able to compete with even great kings and that he was invited to the court by Vīśaladeva of Anahilavada and much honoured.

The date of Jagadu's death is not known. From the *Jagaducharita*, it seems he survived for some years after the great famine. As his death was mourned by Arjunadeva of Anahilavada he must have died before V S. 1351 (A. D. 1274-5) the last year of Arjunadeva's reign.

Pothada was another prominent Jain of this period. Doda, Pothada's father lived in Nandurpur in Avantika. Fortune smiled upon him and he became exceedingly rich. The king of Nanduri, wanting his wealth cast him into prison for some time. When Doda was released, he left Nanduri and went to Vijapur. From Vijapur he went to Cambay won great fame by his generosity and came to be known as Kanakagiri. Once he happened to go to Deogiri

where he built a magnificent 'poshadhasāla' (a monastery¹¹ or nunnery).

Deda had a son named Pethada or Prithvidhara. The latter's guru Dharmaghoshasūri advised him to seek fortune in Mandapadurga. Pethada acted according to the advice of his spiritual preceptor and became exceedingly rich. King Jayasimha Paramār of Mālwa, honoured him much and gave him ensigns of royalty.¹²

Dharmaghoshasūri who had induced him to seek fortune in Malwa, came to Mandapadurga and advised Pethada to build Jain temples. Pethada, acting according to the sūri's suggestion, built eighty four Jain temples in different parts of India. His edifice at Mandavagadha was superb. It was adorned with gold knob and staff and built at a cost of 18 lakhs. On the Satrunjaya hill, Pethada built a temple to Santinatha.¹³

Pethada experienced some difficulty in building a temple at Deogiri but overcame the same by his generosity. Hemadi, a minister at Deogiri, was coming in his way, so, to please him, Pethada opened alms-houses in Hemadi's name at several places. The minister was so much pleased with

(11-12) Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihas*, pp. 404-5

(13) *Ibid*, p 406.

Pethada that he persuaded the King to give Pethada Shah enough land to build a Jain temple in the heart of Deogiri. Pethada Shah spent large sums of money to erect this temple and called it Amulyaprasad. This temple was completed in V S 1835 (or A. D. 1278-9).¹⁴

Pethada's father showed his zeal for Jainism by spending much money to preserve the forty-five Āgamas or Jain Scriptures. Many writers were employed to make copies of the Āgamas and the copies were sent to his seven Sarasvatī bhandaras at Broach, Deogiri, Mandavagadha, Abu and other places.¹⁵

Pethada made pilgrimages to Satrunjaya, Giranara and Mt. Abu. He had taken the Parigraha-pramāṇa vrata or the fifth vow of a Jain layman when he was at Vidysapura (Vijapura).¹⁶

Pethada's son Jhanjhana was a chip of the old block. He married Saubhagyadevi, daughter of Bhima Sheth of Delhi. In V S. 1340 or A. D. 1284 he started from Mandapedurga with Dharmaghoshastri and Jain Sangha and made a pilgrimage to Satrunjaya and Giranara

(14) Ratnamandiragani *Upadēśataraṅginī*, pp. 97-8.

(15) *Upadēśabhojavallī*, pp. 203-4; Deral, Loc. Cit., p. 406. (16) *Ibid.*, p. 404-5.

On the way, he halted at Balāpura, Chitrakuta (Chitod), Arbudagiri, Chandrāvati, Pralhādanapura (Palanpura), Anahilapura, Taranagiri (Tarangā) Karnāvati and several other places. At Balāpura, Jhānjhana set up twenty-four images, and built a temple to Pārsvanātha, at Karāhetaka, at the suggestion of Dharmaghosha, his preceptor. At Karnāvati, he rewarded a bard for composing a good poem, set free ninety-six prisoners and took his meals with Sārangadeva, King of Gujarat¹

According to the *Upadesataranginī*, Jhānjhana Shah, hearing that Ābhu Srimah of Tharapadra (or Tharada), who had the biruda of 'Paschima Mandalika', did not take his meals without feeding the Jains that paid visits to his place, went to Tharapadra with a Jain congregation of 32,000 and put up at Ābhu's place Ābhu Shah was, on that day, engaged in religious ceremonies; but his brother Jinadāsa feasted the congregation and gave presents to the Jains. Next day, Jhānjhana fell at the feet of Ābhu and begged forgiveness for putting him to a severe test²

(1) Ibid, p 406

(2) Ratnamandiraganī, *Upadesataranginī*, pp 138-9.

Jhānjhans like his father was an excellent follower of Jina influential member of the Jain community and great donor,

We shall now deal with the activities of the Jain monks in the Vaghela Period. Jagatchandrasūri, founder of the Tapa gachha, had two prominent pupils-Vijayachandra and Devendrasūri. Before Vijayachandra entered the order of Jain monks he worked as a clerk of the famous Jain minister Vastupala who had helped him to become an Acharya or Doctor. There was some difference of opinion between Vijayachandra and Devendra. The former lived continuously for several years at Cambay and his followers came to be known as Vriddhasālika because they with their preceptor lived in a big monastery Devendra and his pupils who wandered from one place to the other had to put up at a small monastery when they came to Cambay so Devendra's followers came to be known as "Laghusālika".

Vijayachandra allowed his pupils to keep some more clothes besides their daily requirements they were moreover allowed to take milk, ghee, fruits and vegetables everyday and to perform

‘pratikramana’, a religious ceremony, with the Jain laymen.’

Devendrasūri, on the other hand, asked his pupils to observe the old strict rules of conduct. He was a great orator. When he delivered sermons, hundreds of Jains attended them. Vastupāla was one of the influential members of the Jain community who attended his sermons at Cambay. Devendragani was the author of five new *Karmagranthas* with commentaries, the *Siddhapanchāsika* and the *Devavandana*, *Guruvandana* and *Pratyākhaṇ Bhasya*. He was, moreover, the joint author of the *Sudarsana-charita*. The *Śrāvakadinakṛitya* and the *Dharma-ratnatika* were his other works²

In V. S. 1302 (A. D. 1246), Sarvananda composed the *Chandraprabha-charita*. In V. S. 1304 (A. D. 1248), Paramanandasūri, pupil of Devabhadra, completed the *Hitopadeśamālāvṛtti*. In V. S. 1305 (A. D. 1249), Yaśodeva wrote the *Dharmopadeśa prakaraṇa* in Prākṛit. About this time, the Jains of Devapattana and Dholaka district decided to open a good Jain library. In V. S. 1307, Ajitaprabhasūri, pupil of Viraprabhasūri,

(1) Ibid, p. 401.

(2) Ibid, 407

composed the *Sāntināthacharita*. He is also known as the author of the *Bhāvanāśāstra*. In the same year, Purnakalāśa, pupil of Jīnēśvarasūri of Kharatara gachha, completed a commentary on the Prakrit *Dyātraya* of Hemasūri. Abhayatilaka who had studied under Laxmitilaka the author of the *Pratyakabuddha* in V S 1311 (A. D. 1255), was the author of a commentary on the Sanskrit *Dyātraya* of Hemasūri in V S. 1313 (A. D. 1256) and the *Nyāyālakṣaṇatippaṇa*.

In V S 1312 (A. D. 1256) Chandratilaka Upadhyaya pupil of Jīnēśvarasūri of the Kharatara gachha completed the *Abhayakumāracharita* which was begun in Vagbhatamera (Bahadamer). He had studied under Nemlehandragani, Siddhasena Muni Gunabhadrasūri, Vijayadevasūri, Jinapala Upadhyaya and Suraprabha who was the author of the *Brahma-Kalpa* and who had won victory over the Digambara Yamadanda in Cambay. Besides Purnakalāśa, Laxmitilaka, Abhayatilaka and Chandratilaka, Jīnēśvarasūri had Jinaprabodhasūri, Jinaratnasūri, Devamurti, Vivekasamudragani, Sarvarajagani and other learned pupils.

Vidyānandasūri pupil of Devendrasūri of Tapāgachha was the author of the *Vidyānanda*

a work on grammar Before he became a Jain monk in V. S 1302, he was known as Viradhavala. His father's name was Jinachandra. He was a native of Ujjain¹

Prabodhachandragani, pupil of Jineśvarasūri, was the author of a commentary on the *Sandehadolāvali*, which he completed in V S. 1320 (or A. D. 1264) He was trained by Padmadevagani, Gunabhadra Vāchanacharya, Vijayadevasūri and Jinapāla Upadhyaya.²

In V S. 1322 (A. D. 1266), Dharmatilaka, pupil of Jineśvarasūri, composed the *Ajitaśānti Jinastavatikā*³ In the same year, Munidevasūri, pupil of Madanachandrasūri of Vadi Devasūri gachha, composed the Śāntināthacharita in Sanskrit⁴ He also wrote a commentary on the *Dharmopadeśamālā* of Jayasimhasūri

In V. S. 1322 (A. D. 1266), Simhatlakasūri, pupil of Vibudhachandrasūri, composed the *Mantrarājaraḥasya* and *Lilāvati*. His other works are the *Vardhamānavidyākālpa*, *Ganitatilakavṛtti* and the *Bhuvanadīpakavṛtti* in V. S. 1326 (A. D. 1270)⁵

In V. S. 1324 (A. D. 1268), Narachandra,

(1) *Gurvavali*, Verses 152-72 (2) *Kantivijaya*, Baroda, No 260 (3) Weber, No 1265 (4) Peterson, I, 4.

pupil of Simhasūri of Kasadraha gatchha completed the *Prāśastaka*. The *Janmasaundra*, with commentary is his another work.⁴

Pradyumnasūri, pupil of Kāśhāprabha of Chandragatchha completed the *Samarāditya-saṅkshapa* in V S. 1324 (A. D. 1263). At the request of his brother he composed the *Pravrajyāvādhāna-Mūluddhāsprakarāna* in V S. 1338. He compiled the works of Udayaprabha, Devendra Dharmakumara, Balachandra, Manatunga, Munideva Ratnaprabha and other writers.

In V S. 1325 Vinayachandrasūri pupil of Ratnasambhasūri completed *Kalpanirvyakta-Dipāṭhākalpa*.⁵ Ratnaprabhasūri pupil of Paramanandasūri composed the *Kavalayamālakathā* in Sanskrit, about V S. 1325. In V S. 1328 Jinprabodhasūri completed the *Durgapadaprabodhatikā*.⁶ In V S. 1329 (A. D. 1273), Somachandra, pupil of Jayamangalasūri completed the *Vṛttaratnākaraṭikā*.

Dharmaghoshasūri of Tapa gatchha was the author of the *Saṅghāṭhārabbhāṣya-Ḍhaṅga*.

(5) *Journals Catalogue*, introduction p. 66. (6) Kielhorn, II No. 388.

(1) Peterson I 64; Bühler III, No. 107 (2) Peterson III 304. (3) *Journals catalogue* introduction p. 57

vandanābhāṣya-vivaraṇa, *Kālasvarūpavihāra*, *Śrāddha Jīnakalpa*, *Chātūrvimsatī Jīnastuti*, and the *Dūṣhāmākāla-saṅghastōtra*.⁴ He was the guru of Pethada. He died in V.S 1357 (A.D. 1331).

Somaprābhāsūri, pupil of Dharmaghoshasūri of Tapāgatchha, was the author of the *Yatīyitakalpā* and twenty-eight short poems. He won a victory in debate over the Brahmins of Chitrakuta (Chitoda). He was a great scholar. His prophecy about the fall of Bhimapalli had come true.⁵

Kshemakīrti, pupil of Vijayachandra of Tapāgatchha, wrote a commentary on the *Bṛihat Kalpasūtra* of Bhadrabāhuswami in V.S 1332 (A.D. 1276).⁶

Manatūṅgachārya was the author of the *Śreyāṇśācharita*. In V.S. 1334 (A.D. 1278), Dharmakumāra, pupil of Vibudhaprabha of Nāgendra-kula, completed the *Salibhadracharita*.⁷ About the same time, Vivekasagara completed the *Puṇyasāra Kathānaka*.⁸

(4) Peterson, III, 312, Weber, No. 1975, Bhāṇḍārakara, V, No. 1232, Velankara, No. 1805, Kantivijaya, No. 105.

(5) Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihāsa*, pp. 414-5 (6) Peterson, V, 101 (7) Velāṇākara, No. 1779.

(8) *Jesalmere Catalogue*, Introduction p. 53

pupil of Simhasūri of Kāśādrāha gacchha completed the *Prāśnaśataka*. The *Janmasamudra*, with commentary is his another work.⁶

Pradyumnasūri pupil of Kanākāprabha of Chandragacchha completed the *Samarāditya-saṅkṣhepa* in V S. 1324 (A. D. 1368). At the request of his brother he composed the *Pravrajyāvādhāna-Mulnuddhāprakarana* in V S. 1388. He compiled the works of Udayaprabha, Devendra Dharmakumara, Balachandra, Manatunga, Mundeva Ratnaprabha and other writers.⁷

In V S 1325 Vinayachandrasūri, pupil of Ratnasimhasūri, completed *Kalpaniriyukta-Dīpālīkāṭṭha*. Ratnaprabhasūri pupil of Paramahansa sūri composed the *Kuvalayanāḍāṭṭhā* in Sanskrit, about V S 1325. In V S 1328 Jinprabodhasūri completed the *Durgopadoprabodhatīkā*.⁸ In V S. 1329 (A. D. 1373), Somachandra, pupil of Jayamangalasūri, completed the *Vṛttaratnāṭṭharatīkā*.

Dharmaghoshasūri of Tapa gacchha was the author of the *Saṅghāchārabhāṣya-Ōkṣya-*

(5) *Journals Catalogue* Introduction, p. 68. (6) Kiehlhorn, II, No. 388.

(1) Peterson I 64; Bühler III, No. 107 (2) Peterson, III 304. (8) *Journals catalogue*, introduction p. 57

of reading Jinarājastava, Dwiakshara Nemistava, Panchaparamesthistava, Pārsvastava, Vīrastava, Saradastotra, Sarvagnabhaktistava, and Siddhāntastava In V. S 1352 (A D 1296), he composed the *Vibhramatikā*, and in V S 1356 (A. D 1300) the *Srenikaoharita*



In V S 1334, Prabhachandrasūri, pupil of Ohandraprabha of Rajagatohha completed the *Prabhavacharita*. It is a very important work to a student of the History of Gujarat.⁹

In V S. 1337 Mulechandra wrote a commentary on the *Vishayanigraha Tulaka*. In V S 1338 Manikyasūri completed the *Sakunasaroddhara*¹⁰

In V S 1349 Mallhenasūri pupil of Udayaprabhasūri of Nagendragatohha completed the *Syadvadamanjari*.¹¹

Jinaprabhasūri pupil of Jinasimhasūri of Kharataragatohha commenced the *Vivāha-Tīrthakalpa-Kalpaprādīpa* in V S 1327 (A. D 1271) and completed, it in V S 1389 (A. D 1333) The work contains 88 Kalpas They were written after making pilgrimages to the holy places of the Jains and contain many historical facts some of which are not recorded elsewhere It is said that the sūri had taken a vow to compose one poem every day For Somatilakasūri of Tapagatohha he had composed many stanzas or short poems Time seems to have destroyed many of these but we can still have the pleasure

(9) Velankara, No 1755, (10) Desai, Ibid, p 416

of reading Jinarāṣṭava, Dvīakshara Nemistava, Panchaparamesthistava, Parsvastava, Vīrastava, Saradastotra, Sarvagnabhaktistava, and Siddhanta-stava In V. S 1352 (A. D 1296), he composed the *Vibhramatikā*, and in V S 1356 (A. D 1300) the *Srenikacharita*



Chapter V

Jainism in the 14th Century

In 1297 A. D.¹ Madhava a Nagara Bhahmin and minister of Karna Vaghela of Anahilavada, sold the liberty of Gujarat at the gates of Delhi by inviting Aladdin Khilji to conquer this country. The Muslims took possession of this province plundered and burnt cities and harassed the people. Gujarat now experienced a new life. Her people led a dependent life. Their liberty was lost. They had no freedom of conscience. Important offices in the state were captured by the Muslims. Hindu and Jain temples were demolished and mosques erected in their places. Education of the sons and daughters of this land was neglected. Sanskrit and Prakrit languages received a step-motherly treatment. For all these and many other evils Madhava was responsible. Instead of taking

(1) According to some scholars, the Muslims conquered Gujarat in 1299 A. D.

revenge on King Karna, he took revenge on the people of Gujarāta by bringing them under Muslim yoke.

The Jains did suffer by the Muslim conquest of Gujarāta. But even in these hard times, they maintained their trade and temples, obtained permission to repair old jinalayas (temples) or build new ones and served very faithfully Sarasvati, the goddess of learning, by contributing to Sanskrit, Prakrit and Gujarātī literature very generously, at a time when other communities in the province had almost entirely given up her worship.

It is a mistake to suppose that no new temples were erected in the Muslim Period. It is true that the Muslim rulers were not in favour of erecting new temples; but, at times, they gave their consent to the erection of new temples or did not object to the repair of old ones. In V S. 1366 (A. D. 1309-10), Jeśala Shah of Cambay erected a temple to Ajitanāth, the second Tirthankara,¹ and Samarasimha or Samarā Shah repaired the temple of Ādinātha on the Śatrunjaya Hill, when the image of the Tirthankara was

(1) Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihāsa*, p. 424

destroyed by the Muslims in V S 1869 (A. D. 1812-13).²

Samarasimha who repaired the temple of Adinatha on the Śatrunjaya Hill, belonged to Upakess vamsa and Vosata kula. Salakhass was his great grand-father. He had a son named Ajada whose son Gośala had, by his wife Bhanumati, three sons named Āsadhara, Datta and Luno. Āsadhara married Ratnashri. Luno had a wife named Latchhi or Lakshmi. Datta's wife Bholi had three sons—Sahajapala, Sahas and Samarasimha. Sahajapala erected a temple to twenty-four Tirthankaras in Devagiri in the Deccan. Sahana took up his abode in Cambay and won name fame and glory by his good deeds. Anubhāvīda was Samarasimha's domicile of choice. Samarasimha was a well-known Jeweller in the old capital of Gujarāta. He exercised great influence at court. When he came to know that Adinatha's temple on the Śatrunjaya Hill was destroyed by the Muslims he paid a visit to Alapakhana the-suba of Gujarat, and obtained a "firmana" to repair or rebuild the temple. The Suba had also given necessary instructions to Malek Ahidara his subordinate in this connection.³

(2) Śatrunjayakalpa in the *Tirthakalpa*. (3) *Jīva Vijaya Jaina Atthakāṇṭha Geyara Kāvya Samāhāsa* p. 233-42.

When the Jains came to know of Suba's firmana, they gave a rousing reception to Samarā Shah and advised him to set up a new image of Ādinatha on the Satrunjaya Hill Samarā Shah sent his men to the king of Ārasana with presents The king was a strict vegetarian and a firm believer in the principles of Jainism; so he consented to give the required marble from his mine without any charge Marble was taken in carts to Palitana. Sixteen clever sculptors were sent from Anahilavāda to Palitana to prepare the image Balachandra Muni was to supervise the preparation of the image ⁴

When the sculptors completed their work, good news was sent to Samarā Shah at Anahilavāda Samarā Shah, then, made up his mind to make a pilgrimage to the holy hill in the company of the Jain congregation to set up the image of Ādinatha in the newly constructed temple Invitations were sent to the Jains of far off places ⁵

Among the Jain monks who made the pilgrimage to the holy hill in the company of Samarā Shah were Vinayachandrasuri, Ratnākarasuri of Brihadgatchha, Padmachandra—

(4) Ibid, pp 542-3 (5) Ibid appendix, pp 129-30.

destroyed by the Muslims in V S 1369 (A D 1312-13).¹

Samarasimha who repaired the temple of Adinatha on the Satrunjaya Hill belonged to Upakeśa vamsa and Vesata kula.² Salakha was his great grand-father. He had a son named Ajada whose son Godala had, by his wife Bhanumati, three sons named Āśadhara, Deśala and Luno. Āśadhara married Ratnashri. Luno had a wife named Latohhi or Lakshmi. Deśala's wife Bholi had three sons—Sahajapala, Sahas and Samarasimha. Sahajapala erected a temple to twenty-four Tirthankaras in Devagiri in the Deccan. Sahas took up his abode in Cambay and won name fame and glory by his good deeds. Anshilavāda was Samarasimha's domicile of choice. Samarasimha was a well-known jeweller in the old capital of Gujarāta. He exercised great influence at court. When he came to know that Adinatha's temple on the Satrunjaya Hill was destroyed by the Muslims he paid a visit to Alapakhana the-suba of Gujarat and obtained a "firmana" to repair or rebuild the temple. The Suba had also given necessary instructions to Malek Ahidara his subordinate in this connection.

(1) *Satrunjayakalpa* in the *Trishakalpa*. (2) *Jinavijaya Jain Atikāritā Gurya Kavya Samakha*, pp 233-42.

was given a tumultuous welcome by the Jains and Thakors of the villages on the way. He spent money freely and was very hospitable to the Jains who had joined the congregation⁹

There were no big inns in those days; so when the congregation reached Palitana, Samara Shah pitched tents on the banks of Lalitasara, erected by Lalitadevi, wife of Vastupala. About this time, Sahajapala from Devagiri and Sahana from Cambay came to Palitana with congregation. Samara Shah's joy knew no bounds when he saw his brothers. He paid his respects to the Jain monks who had come with the congregation from Cambay. Among the prominent persons who had accompanied Sahana were Sangana, brother of Pataka mantri, Lala, Simhabhata, Vijala, Madana, Molhaka and Ratnasimha. Samara Shah gave all the pilgrims a very warm welcome¹⁰

On the 14th day of the bright half of Maha in the Vikram year 1371 (A. D. 1315), Samara Shah set up the image of Adinatha, in the completed temple on the holy hill. This is proved by other evidence. In the Adesvara tunka on the Satrunjaya hill, the inscriptions at the

(9) Ibid., appendix, pp. 136-7

(10) Ibid, appendix, pp. 137-38.

sun of Devasuri gatchha Sumatisuri of Sāndar gatchha, Virasuri of Bhavadar gatchha Sarvadev suri of Tharapadragatchha Jagatsuri of Brahman gatchha Amradevasuri, of Nivratti gatchha who wrote an account of this pilgrimage of Samars Shah to the Satrunjaya, hill before V S 1393 (or A. D 1336) Siddhasena Acharya of Nanakagana, Dharmaghoshasuri of Brihad gatchha Prabhanandasuri of Nagendra gatchha and Vajrasenasuri pupil of Hemasuri.⁶

Among the prominent Jains who joined the congregation were Sanghapati Jaltra and Sanghapati Krishna Haripala Devapala Landhaka, son of Sthiradeva of Vatsakula, Pralhadana Soal, Sodhaka and Devaraja who had won name and fame as a great donor.⁷

Alapakhana, Suba of Gujarat who had granted permission to rebuild the temple gave ten guards to protect the congregation.⁸

The congregation started from Anahilapataka and went to Palitana via Series (near Kalols Mehsana District), Sarkhej (near Ahmedabad) and Dholka. At Series Samars Shah worshipped Parvanatha and held a festival for eight days. He

(6) Ibid, pp 243-5. (7) Ibid, pp. 144-4. (8) Ibid, pp. 135 x 3

was given a tumultuous welcome by the Jains and Thakors of the villages on the way. He spent money freely and was very hospitable to the Jains who had joined the congregation.

There were no big inns in those days; so when the congregation reached Palitana, Samara Shah pitched tents on the banks of Lalitasara, erected by Lalitadevi, wife of Vastupala. About this time, Sahajapala from Devagiri and Sahana from Cambay came to Palitana with conegation. Samara Shah's joy knew no bounds when he saw his brothers. He paid his respects to the Jain monks who had come with the congregation from Cambay. Among the prominent persons who had accompanied Sahana were Sangana, brother of Pataka mantri, Lala, Simhabhata, Vijala, Madana, Molhaka and Ratnasimha. Samara Shah gave all the pilgrims a very warm welcome.¹⁰

On the 14th day of the bright half of Maha in the Vikram year 1371 (A D 1315), Samara Shah set up the image of Adinatha, in the completed temple on the holy hill. This is proved by other evidence. In the Adesvara tunka on the Satrunjaya hill, the inscriptions at the

(9) Ibid., appendix, pp 136-7

(10) Ibid, appendix, pp. 137-38.

foot of the images of Satohikadevi, Āsadhara and Mahipaladeva confirm this fact. Satohikadevi was the Kuladevi or family deity of Samara Shah Mahipaladeva who gave marble from his mine without taking any charge was the king of Ārasana and Āsadhara was the uncle of Samara Shah. All the three inscriptions give the date mentioned above. In addition the inscriptions at the foot of the images of Satohikadevi and Āsadhara give the genealogy of Samara Shah¹¹

The honour of performing the ceremony at the time of setting up the images is shared by Siddhasūri of Upakes'agatohha and Ratnakarasūri of Tapagatohha. The *Samarasenhardasa* gives this credit to Siddhasūri, while in an inscription of V S 1449 (A. D. 1392-3) in the temple of Vimalanatha on Giranara, in the *Satrunjayatirthoddhātuprabandha* and the *Satrunjayarāsa* this honour is given to Ratnasūri¹². As many images were set up on the same day it is probable that

(11) संवत् १३७१ वर्षे माहसुदि १२ सोमे श्रीमद्वेदेवलो देवा
श्रीशिव ता वर ता सौम्य प्रसुक्त कुटुंबसुखारो
वेदेने निमज्जनेदी श्रीशिवसमृद्धिः करिता :

१२ आचार वसुधापथे सुपुरो रत्नकराहाः पुतादने रत्नकरा-
वत् प्रदाने वेदो वनो शिर्षकः । देवके वसुधावत्पुत्रविदेवो
प्रदिष्टः.....

the ceremony of setting up some was performed by Siddhasūri and of others by Ratnasūri.^{12A}

A festival was held by Deśala, Samarā Shah's father, to celebrate this event. Sumptuous dishes were served to the Jain congregation for several days. Poor persons were given alms, Jain monks and nuns were given clothes. Beggars were feasted.¹³ Samarā Shah lived in Palitāna for twenty days and made arrangements for the maintenance of the temple. Several servants were appointed to worship Jina. Gardeners were appointed to look after the gardens from which flowers were supplied to the temple for the worship of Jina.¹⁴

From Palitāna, Samarā Shah went to Giranāra with the congregation and worshipped Neminātha, the twenty-second Tirthankara. Here Samarā received the good news of the birth of a son and lived for ten days. From Giranāra, he went to Devapattana where he was given a rousing reception by the king. The congregation paid

12A Vimalanātha Prasasti, v 63 'Pratistha' or the image of Adinātha, the principal deity was certainly performed by Siddhasūri as his contemporary and eye-witness Amradevasūri says.

(13-14) *Jain Atihāsa Gurjar Kāvya Sanchaya*,
p 247

a visit to the well-known Somanatha temple and adorned it with a five colour-flag This event shows that the Jains were not hostile to Brahmins but were generous enough to adorn a Siva temple with a flag¹⁵

Samara Shah held the astahnikamahotsava or a festival for eight days at Devapattana and went to Ajar to worship Parvanatha. From Ajar the congregation went to Kodinar and worshipped Ambikadevi. Dotala, Samara's father adorned Ambika's temple with a flag¹⁶

The congregation then went to Div where the king received Samara Shah and Haripala, a multimillionaire held a feast. Astahnikamahotsava was held and the beggars were given alms¹⁷

From Div the congregation went to Anahilavada via Patdi, Sankhevara and Harij. The Jain Sangha of Anahilavada gave a rousing reception to Samara Shah when he entered the capital on the 7th day of the black half of Chaitra of the Vikrama year 1371. 5000 persons were invited to dinner. Sanghapati Dotala is said to have

(15) Ibid, pp. 247-9

(16) Ibid pp. 249-50

(17) Ibid, pp. 250-51

spent 2770,000 coins in rebuilding the temple of Ādinātha¹⁸

In V. S. 1375 (A. D. 1318-9), Deśala again made a pilgrimage to the holy hill with seven Sanghapatis and 2000 persons and spent eleven lakhs¹⁹

According to the *Nābhīnandanoddhāra-prabandha*, Emperor Gyasuddin was much pleased with Samarā Shah and highly honoured him. At Samarā's request, the emperor set free the lord of Pandu deśa²⁰

This Gyasuddin was probably Gyasuddin Tughlak (A. D. 1320 to A. D. 1325) who was a contemporary of Samarā Shah. Balban's another name was also Gyasuddin ; but the *Nābhīnanadano-ddhāra prabandha*, implies that Samarā Shah came to be acquainted with him after he rebuilt the temple of Ādinātha on the holy hill , so he cannot be Gyasuddin Balban who died in A. D. 1286²¹

(18) *Nābhīnandanoddhāraprabandha*, V v 97

(19) *Jain Atīkhāsika Gurjar Kāvya Samchaya*-Appendix, p p 160-1

(20) *Ibid*, p 163

(21) According to Kakkasūri, Kutbuddin, king of Delhi, had invited Samarā Shah to Delhi, after

According to the Prabandha writer Samars Shah was appointed as the Suba of Telang dal where he set free many prisoners and obliged many chieftains. He adorned Urangalpura with Jain temples invited many Jain families to settle there and won name fame and glory as a suba²². This account of Kakharri, though unconfirmed is not unreliable because he was a Guru and contemporary of Samars Shah.

About V S 1369 (A D 1312-13) the temples of Vimala Shah and Tejabpala on Mt. Abu were destroyed by the Muslims. When the Jains came to know of this they undertook the work of repairing the temples. The Vimalavarahi was repaired by Vijada son of Dhanasimha of Mandor his five brothers Laligasimha and Laligasimha's two brothers. Thus the whole temple of Vimala Shah was repaired by nine persons. The "Pratistha" (or the ceremony of

Buddhasir's Death in V S. 1376 (A. D. 1319.) This seems to be evidently a mistake because Kutubdila who died in A. D. 1310 was not a contemporary of Samars Shah. The king who invited Samars Shah to Delhi was Ghasuddin Tughlak whose dates A. D. 1310-25 sh w that he was a contemporary of Samars Shah.

(22) Jain *Atkārika Gurjar Kāvya Samahaya*, Appendix, pp. 163-4.

setting up the image) was performed by Gnanachandrasūri.²³ The inscriptions at the foot of many images in the cells near the principal temple show that many of them were set up about this time. In the Gudhamandapa, we see, even to-day, the statues of Gosala and Gunadevi, the 'grand-father and grand-mother of Vijaya respectively and of Mahanasimha and Minaladevi, the parents of Laligasimha. These statues were set up in the year V.S. 1378 (A. D. 1322) when the 'pratistha' of the temple was performed²⁴

Tejahpala's temple was repaired by Pethada Sanghavi, son of Chandasimha in V S 1378 (A. D. 1321-2) when he had come on a pilgrimage to Mt Abu, with the Jain congregation²⁵

There was a famine in Gujarat in the V. years 1376-77. So Bhima gave away large sums of money in charity. This Bhima was probably Bhimashah who erected Bhimasimhaprasad on Mt. Abu²⁶

In V S 1394 (A D 1337-1338), Mantri Bhanaka, son of Mantri Jagasimha and grand-

(23) *Prachina Jaina Lekha Sangraha*, II, No 132

(24) *Ibid*, No. 132

(25) *Jayantavijaya*, Abu, p. 92

(26) Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, p. 429

son of mantri Abhayasimha set up an image of Ambikadevi in Vimalavasi on Mt Abu."

Up to this time, we dealt with the services of Jain laymen and their contribution to art. Now we shall deal with the literary activities of the Jains

Jinaprabhasuri, pupil of Jinasimharin of Laghu Kharata gachha composed the *Vindhastikabhalpa* between V 1327 and 1339 (A. D. 1371 and 1383).⁽²⁷⁾ His other works in the 14th century are commentary on the *Kalpantra* in V S 1364 (1307-8 A. D.) the *Sadhupratibhomanasutrasvriti* (A. D. 1307-8) *Ayatanantustavavriti*, *Upasargaharasatavriti* and *Bhayaaharasatavriti* in A. D. 1308-9.⁽²⁸⁾ *Dharmadharmopprakaraka*⁽²⁹⁾ *Anasyabansutrasvriti* *Chaturvidhabhavasatula* *Topomatakatitana* and the *Surisnantropadisa*.⁽³⁰⁾

Upto this time the Jains used palm-leaves to write books. In the beginning of the 14th century paper was used. The earliest available

(27) Ibid p. 429

(28-29) Ibid, p. 418 Peterson IV 114, Weber N 1944.

(30) Peterson, I 82, Weber No. 1965

(31) Peterson, V 111.

(32) Desai, Loc. cit., p. 412.

books written on paper bear the date V S. 1356-57 (A. D 1300-01)

In V.S 1361(A D 1304-5), Merutungacharya, pupil of Chandraprabha of Nagendragatchha, completed the *Prabandhachintāmanī*. This is one of the few historical works written in Sanskrit. It is a work in five parts. The first part deals with Vikrama, Kalidasa, Siddhasena Divākara, Salivāhana, Vanarāja and other Chāvada kings, Mularāja Solankī, Munjarāja, Sindhula and Bhoja. The second part deals with the relations of Bhīma and Bhoja and gives accounts of Fulachandra Digambara, Magh Pandit, Dhanapala, Mayura, Bāna and Manatunga. The third part deals with Siddharāja Jayasīma of Anahilavāda and gives short accounts of Līlā Vaidya, Udayana Mantri, Santu Mantri, Minaladevi, conquest of Malwa, Siddha-Hema, Rudramāl, Sahasralinga tank, Ramchandra, Jayamangala, Yasahpāla, Hemasūri, Navaghana of Saurashtra, Sajjana Mantri, Siddharāja's pilgrimage to Somanātha, Debate between Vadi Devasuri and Kumudachandra, and Abhada Shah. The fourth part deals with Kumārāpala, the Chaulukya king of Anahilavāda and gives account of his birth, parentage, early career, accession to the throne, and conversion to Jainism. It also contains many

stories about the intercourse of Hemasūri and Kumārapala. Short notes on Vāgbhata, Āmabbhata Udayachandrasūri, Alinga Vamaraśi, Saṅkara charya, Ajayapala Bala-Mulārāja, Vastupala and Tojāhpala are also found there. The fifth part gives a short account of Nandārāja, Śilāditya, fall of Valabhi, Munja, Govardhana Lakshmanasena, Jayachanda Jagaddora Paramardī Prithvirāja, Varahmihir Bhartṛhari Vagbhata Vaidya, Kshetrpala and others.

We have given above a more or less detailed account of the contents of the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* because it is an important work on the history of Gujarata. Mr Forbes and Dr Bhagvanlal have made much use of this work while writing the history of Gujarata in the *RasMalā* and the *Bombay Gazetteer* respectively. The *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* is translated into several languages.

The *Vicharavareṇu*²² is another important work of Merutungasūri. It gives useful dates and contains short notes on Kalacharya, Haribhadra and Jinabhadra. Some believe that this Merutunga is not the author of the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi*.

The *Mahayamshacharita* or the *Upadesanti*²³

(22) Velankara, No. 1648 (24) Petersen III 268; Petersen VI 43; Weber II 1074

is another work of Merutungasūri Among other things, it deals with the Jain Tirthankaras Rishabhadeva, Santinatha, Neminatha, Parśvanatha and Mahāvīraswami

Feru, son of Chandra Thākkura, a staunch Jain, composed the *Vāstusāra*³⁵ in V. S 1872 (A. D. 1315-16) In the same year, Kamalāprabha, pupil of Ratnaprabhasuri, completed the *Pundarikācharita*

Somatilaka, pupil of Somaprabhasūri of Tapāgatchha, was the author of the *Navyakshetra-samāsa*, *Vicharasutra* and *Saptatisatasthānaka*.³⁶ The last work was composed in V S 1387 (A. D. 1330-31) The dignity of Sūri was conferred on Somatilaka in the year V S. 1373 (A. D. 1316-17)

Sudhākalaśa, pupil of Maladhari Rajasekhara-sūri composed the *Sangitopnīshad*, a work on music, in A. D. 1323-4 The abridged edition of this work was completed in A. D. 1349-50³⁶ The *Ekāksharanāmamālā* is another work of Sudhākalaśa³⁷

(35) Kantivijaya Bhandar, Baroda, No, 68

(36) Velankara, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the library of the B B R Asiatic Society, No 1683*

(37) Weber, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Berlin Library, No 1702*

Jinakusalasūri of Kharataragachha was born in V S 1330 (A. D 1273-4). His father's name was Jilhagara Mantri and mother's name Jayashri. He entered the order of Jain monks in V S 1347 (1290-1 A. D.) and had the dignity of sūri conferred on him in V S. 1377 (A. D. 1320-1). To celebrate this occasion, Tejapala Shah of Anahlavada held a festival. The Sūri wrote a commentary on Jinadattasūri's *Chaturpandan-Devarandanamālaka*."

Somatilakasūri (or Vidyatilakasūri), pupil of Sanghatilakasūri of Rodrapalliya gachha, composed *Viratkalpa* and *Shaddarshanantaratna* in V S. 1389. The *Sūrataramgini* in V S. 1392, the *Laghustavotika* in V S 1397 and the *Kumardrapālaprabandha*."

Ratnadevaganī wrote a commentary on the *Vajjalaya* of Jayavallabha in V S. 1393 (A. D 1336-7)

About this time Sarvanandasūri pupil of Dhanaprabhasūri composed the *Jagadukarita*."

(35) Kuntivijaya, Baroda No 152.

(39) Paterson, IV 99; Weber No 2006; Buhler VI No 709

(40) Buhler II No. 234. The book is translated into Gujarati.

The work gives the life-story of Jagadu Shah with special reference to his pious and meritorious deeds.

Bhuvanatungasūri of Anchalagatohha wrote a commentary on the *Rishimandala* in V. S 1380 (A. D 1313-4). His other works are the commentaries on the *Āturapratyākhyāna* and the *Chatuh'sarana* ⁴¹

After the Muslim conquest of Gujarata, Sanskrit and Prakrita were not patronized by the state, so many scholars wrote works in the language of the province. In V S 1358 (A. D. 1301-2) the *Navakāravvyākhyāna* was composed in Gujarati. In V S 1369 (A D 1312-13), the *Atichāra* was composed. Among the other Jain works in old Gujarati in the first half of the 14th century may be mentioned The *Katchhulirāsa* in V S. 1303 (A. D 1397), the *Viharamāna-Tīrthankarastava* (V S 1368-A D 1311-12), the *Samarārāso* (About A D 1314-15), the *Sthulibhadraśāga* and the *Charoharikā* ⁴²

Rajasekhara composed the *Chaturvimsatiprabandha* or the *Prabandhakōśa* in V. S 1405

(41) *Jesalmer Catalogue*, introduction, No. 54, Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihāsa*, p. 434

(42) Desai, *Ibid*, pp. 434-5

Jinakusalasūri of Kharataragachha was born in V S 1880 (A. D. 1273-4). His father's name was Jihagare Mantri and mother's name Jayastri. He entered the order of Jain monks in V S 1847 (1290-1 A. D.) and had the dignity of sūri conferred on him in V S 1877 (A. D. 1320-1). To celebrate this occasion, Tejapala Shah of Anahilavada held a festival. The Sūri wrote a commentary on Jinadattasūri's *Okantavandan-Devavandanakulata*.³⁸

Somatilakasūri (or Vidyatilakasūri), pupil of Sanghatilakasūri of Rodrapalliya gachha, composed *Virakalpa* and *Shaddarsanamastrotis* in V S. 1889. The *Silatarangini* in V S. 1891, the *Laghastavatika* in V S 1897 and the *Kandrapalaprabandha*.³⁹

Ratnadevaganī wrote a commentary on the *Vajjalaya* of Jayavallabha in V S. 1893 (A. D. 1336-7).

About this time Sarvanandasūri pupil of Dhanaprabhasūri composed the *Jagadacharita*.⁴⁰

(38) Kuntivijaya, Baroda, No. 181.

(39) Peterson, IV 99; Weber No 2006; Bahler VI No 709.

(40) Bahler II, No. 234. The book is translated into Gujarati.

nandil. (3) Jivadevasūri (4) Arya Khaputāchārya. (5) Pādaliptāchārya (6) Vṛiddhavādī and Siddhasena (7) Malladevasūri (8) Haribhadrāsūri, (9) Bappa-bhattisūri (10) Hemachandrasūri. (11) Harshakavi (12) Harihara. (13) Amarachandra (14) Madana-kīrti (15) Sātavāhana (16) Vankaohula (17) Vikramāditya (18) Nāgārjuna (19) Vatsarāja Udayana (20) Lakshmanasena (21) Madanavarma. (22) Ratna Srāvaka (23) Ābhada (24) Vastupāla-Tejahpāla

The work contains valuable information about the History of Gujarata.

The other works of Rājasekhara are the *Syādvādakalikā* or the *Syādvādadīpikā*, *Shaddarśana-samutthaya*, *Dānashatṭṛimsikā*, *Nyāyā-kandalīpanjikā*, *Ratnākarāvatārikāpanjikā* and eighty-four stories⁴⁴

Gunasamriddhi Mahattarā, pupil of Jinachandra sūri of Kharataragachha, composed the *Anjanā-sundarīcharita* in Prākṛit in V. S. 1406 (A. D. 1349-59). It contains 404 verses.⁴⁵

Merutunga completed the *Kāmadeva-charita* in V. S. 1409 (A. D. 1352-3) and the *Sambhava-*

(44) Buhler, IV, No 278; Velankara, No 1634; Peterson II, 272

(A. D 1349). He belonged to Prasnavahansakula, Kotikagana Madhyama Sakha and Harshapuriya gatchha. He gives the following account of his genealogy "

Schulabhadra
 |
 Maladhari Abhayadeva
 |
 Hemachandra
 |
 Srichandra
 |
 Munkachandra
 |
 Devaprabha
 |
 Narachandra
 |
 Padmadeva
 |
 SriTilaka
 |
 Rajasekhara

The *Chaturvimsatiprabandha* is a rare historical work in Sanskrit. As its name suggests it contains the following 24 prabandhas:—

(1) Bhadrabahu and Varshamihira (2) Arya-

(43) Rajasekhara's Prasasti to Jinaprabhasuri's *Nyayabandhopangika*.

works are the *Yatidinacharyā* in Prakrit and the *Alankārasūra* ⁴⁸

Jayasekharasuri of Anchalagatchha composed the *Upadeśachintāmanī*, *Dhammilacharitamahākāvya* and the *Prabodhachintāmanī* in one year His other works are, the Jain *Kumārasambhava*, *Satrunjayadwātrimsikā*, *Gīranāraddwātrimsikā*, *Mahāvīradwātrimsikā*, *Kṛyāguptastotra* and *Atmāvabodhakulaka* ⁴⁹ The *Prabodhachintāmanī*, referred to above, won him name and fame as a first class Gujarati poet. The *Tribhuvanadīpakaprabandha* is his other known work in Gujarati. Jayasekharasūri was the second pupil of Mahendraprabhasūri and entered the order of Jain monks before V. S 1418. (A D. 1361-2) ⁵⁰

Jayasimhasūri, pupil of Mahendrasūri ⁵¹ of Krishnarshigatchha, completed the *Kumarapala Charita* in V S 1422 (A D 1365-6) It deals

(48) Peterson, IV, 106, Kantivijaya Bhandara, Baroda, this Bhavadevasuri was probably the author of the *Kalkāchāryakatthā* (Peterson, I, 30)

(49-50) Dhruva K. H., Prachina Gurjara Kāvya, introduction, p 28

(51) This Mahendrasuri, being free from avarice, did not accept money; so he was called "Mahatma" by Muhammad Tughlak (1325-51) whose contemporary he was - *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, p. 440

nāṭhacharita in V S. 1418 (A. D. 1361-3). The latter work deals with the life of Sambhavanātha, the third Tirthankara.

Munibhadrasūri of Brihadgatchha prepared an abridged edition of Munidevasūri's *Sāntvanāthacharita*. His genealogy is as follows:—Vadi Devasūri—Bhadresvara—Vijayendu—Manabhadra—Gunabhadra—Munibhadra.

Gunabhadra, Munibhadra's preceptor was a very learned man. Sultan Muhammad Tughlak (A. D. 1326 to 1357) was much impressed by his learning and wanted to give him gold coins, but he refused to accept the same. His pupil edited the *Prasannavaratanamālā* of Devabhadrasūri in V S. 1429 (or A. D. 1372-3).⁴⁶

In V S. 1411 (A. D. 1354-5), Somakirti, pupil of Jinēśvarasūri, composed the *Kātantra-vṛttipanyakā*.⁴⁷

Bhavadēvasūri, pupil of Jinadevasūri of Khandilgatchha composed the *Pārśvanāthacharita* in V S. 1412 (A. D. 1355-56). His other

(46) Desai, *Loc. cit.*, pp. 433-39. Munibhadrasūri won name and fame at the court of Firoz Shah, probably Firoz Tughlak (A. D. 1351-58) whose contemporary he was.

(47) *Jainism's catalogue*, No. 12.

In A. D. 1372-3, Devendrasūri, pupil of Sanghatīlakasūri of Rudrapalliyagatohha, wrote a commentary on the *Prasnottararatnamālā* of Vimalachandrasūri.⁵⁶ In this work, the author says that Somatilaka, author of the *Śilopadeśamālā*,⁵⁷ was his 'gurubandhu'. The *Dānopadeśamālā* in prakrit, with a commentary in Sanskrit, is Devendrasūri's other work.

Mahendraprabhasūri's pupil Merutunga wrote a commentary on the *Kātantravyākharana* in V. S. 1444 (A. D. 1387-8)⁵⁸ and the *Shaddarshanannirṇaya*.⁵⁹ In A. D. 1392-3, he wrote a commentary on the *Saptatībhāṣya*. According to the *Prasasti* to this commentary, the author's other works are the *Meghaduta* with commentary, the *Shaddarshanasanamutahaya*, the *Bālāvabodhavr̥tti* and the *Dhātupārāyana*. Mr Hiralal Hansaraja ascribes the *Bhava-karmaprakriya*, the *Sataka-bhāṣya*, commentary on the *Namutthunam*, the *Susrāddhakathā*, the *Upadeśamūlātīkā* and the *Jesāyaprabandha* to Merutunga. The *Jesāy-*

(56) Peterson, IV, 108, Weber, No 2021

(57) A copy of this work exists in the Kantivijaya Bhandar, Chhāni (near Barodā)

(58) Velankara, No 22.

(59) Velankara, No. 1666

with the life of Parmarbat Kumarpala, the Chaulukya king of Anahilavada who had embraced Jainism. The *Nyāyātīparyodipī* is another work of Jayasamhasūri. It is a commentary on the *Nyāyasāra* of Bhasarvagna. Our poet is said to have defeated Saranga pandit, the author of the *Sarangadharaopaddhati* in a debate. He has also completed a grammar.*

In V S 1426 (A. D. 1369-70) Gunakara, pupil of Gunachandra of Rudrapalliyagatahha wrote a commentary on the *Bhaktamarastotra*.*

In V S 1427 (A. D. 1370-1) Mahendra-prabhasūri, pupil of Madanasūri, and the principal astrologer of Firoz Tughlak (A. D. 1351 to A. D. 1388), wrote the *gantrardya* a work in five parts. His pupil Malayendusūri wrote a commentary on the work.*

Ratnasakharasūri pupil of Hematilakasūri of Brihadgatahha and Nagori Tapagatahha composed the *Sripālācharita* in Prakrit in V S. 1428 (A. D. 1371-72) and the *Chhandabala*.*

(53) Nayachandra, *Hemavīramāhākāvya*, XIV v 23-4.

(53) V lankar No 1817; Peterson, V 207; Bühler II, N 302.

(54) Valankara, No. 235-57; This Book is published (Benares, 1883)

(55) Peterson, IV 118; Peterson, III, 203

Gnānasāgarasūri, pupil of Devasundarasūri, referred to in the last para, composed the *Āvaśyachurni* in A. D. 1383-84, the *Uttarā-dhyayanasutrachurni* in A. D. 1384-85, the *Oghaniryuktichurni*, the *Munisuvratastava* and the *Pārśvanāthastave*.⁶⁴

Kulanandana, another learned pupil of Devasundarasūri, composed the *Vichārāmritasangraha* in A. D. 1386-7, *Siddhāntālapkoddhāra*, *Pragnāpanāsutrachurni*, commentaries on the *Pratikramanasutra*, *Kalpasutra* and the *Kavyasthitistotra*, and several short poems singing the praises of God.⁶⁵

Munisundara, pupil of Somasundarasūri, composed the *Garvedyagosthi* in A. D. 1398-9. Devananda or Devamurti was the author of the *Kshetrasamāsa*. His spiritual descent is as follows —

Chandraprabha—Dharmaghosha—Bhadresvara—Muniprabha—Sarvadeva—Somaprabha—Ratnaprabha—Chandrasimha—Devasimha—Padmatilaka—Shritilaka—Devachandra—Padmaprabhasūri—Devananda or Devamurti.⁶⁶

Nayachandrasūri, pupil of Prasannachandra of

(64) Peterson, II, No. 284, Buhler, VII, 13

(65) Buhler, VII, 18, Velankara, No. 1802

(66) Desai, Loc. cit., p. 444

prabandha says that according to Śārī's instructions Jessaji built a temple to Santanatha and made pilgrimages to Satrunjaya and other holy places of the Jains."

Mahendraprabhasūri or Mahendra of Anchale-gatohha composed the *Tirthamallāprakarana*. He died in V S 1444 (A. D 1888) Some ascribe the *Vishārasaptatikā* to him."

Jayanandasūri, pupil of Somatilakasūri of Tapagatohha composed the *Śikṣābhadrakarita*. The dignity of Ācharya was conferred on him in V S 1420 (A. D 1363-4). He died in A. D 1384-5."

Devasundarasūri of Tapagatohha was a well-known Jain Doctor. With his "advice and assent, many palm-leaf manuscripts were copied on paper. In V S. 1444 (A. D 1387-8) the *Jyotiṣkara-śāstravṛtti*, the *Tirtha-kalpa*, the *Chaityavandana*, *anachurns* and other books were written on palm-leaves. Guṇasāgara Kulamandana Ganarajna, Sadhurajna and Somasundara were some of his learned pupils."

(60) *Jain Sahityaśiṅkhā* pp. 443-2.

(61) *Ibid.*, p. 443-1

(62) Velankara No. 1090; Peterson, V 216

(63) *Desai Loc. Cit.*, p. 443

- | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| (3) Vinayaprabha | The <i>Gautamaswāmī Rāsa</i> | A.D.
1356 |
| (4) ————— | <i>Hansaraja—
Vatchharaja</i> | Cambay.
About
A.D 1355 |
| (5) ————— | <i>Sīla</i> | "
A.D.
1357-? |
| (6) Harasevaka | The <i>Mayanarehā Rāsa</i> | "
A.D.
1357-? |
| (7) Jinodayasūri,
pupil of
Jinakusalasūri
(A.D 1318-9
to A.D 1375.)
He entered the
order of Jain
monks at the
age of seven | The <i>Trivikrama Rāsa</i> | A.D.
1359 |
| (8) Gnānakalasa- | The <i>Jinodayasuri
Pattābhisheka
Rāsa</i> | A.D.
1359 |
| (9) Merunandana- | <i>Shrī
Jinodayasuri
Vivahala</i> | A.D.
1375 |
| (10) Viddhanu
and
a pupil of
Jinodayasūri. | <i>Gnānapanoham
Chopar</i> | ————— |

Krishnarshi gachha composed the *Hamamramahākavya* and the *Rambhāmanjari*. These are some of a few historical works in Sanskrit. In the *Hamamramahākavya* the hero is Hammira but it contains many references to Prithviraja Chohana. In the *Rambhāmanjari* the hero is Jayachandra of Kanoya, but there is not the slightest reference to his Rajasuyayagna, Sanyukta's Swayamvara' or his enmity with Prithviraja. From this Mr G H. Ojha concludes that these stories of the *Prithvirājārjūna* were not known upto V S 1440 (A. D 1383) (about which date the works were composed) but were later interpolations.⁶

We shall now consider what contribution the Jains made to old Gujarati literature prose and poetry in the second half of the 14th century

Name(s) of the author or authors	Title of the work	Date and or Place
(1) Rajasekhara	<i>The Nemandha Pāda</i>	A.D 1349
(2) Vijayabhadra pupil of Lavanyaratna of Āgamagachha	(i) <i>The Kamalāvatī Rāsa</i> (ii) <i>The Kālīvatī Sati Rāsa</i>	...About A.D 1350

Chapter VI.

Somasundarayuga.



The first half of the fifteenth century is known as the Somasundarayuga in Jain history because Somasundarasūri was a very prominent monk of this period. With his 'counsel and consent' and 'advice and assent', the Jains of Gujarata glorified Jainism by building new temples, repairing old ones, setting up new images of Tirthankaras, opening libraries, helping the poor and the needy and by performing many other pious and religious deeds.

In Pralhadanapura (modern Palanapura) there was a Bania named Sajjana who had rendered glorious and meritorious services to Jainism by his pious and meritorious deeds. He had a wife named Malhanadevi who gave birth to a son named Soma in A. D. 1373-4. With the consent of his parents, Soma entered

the order of Jain monks at the age of seven and came to be known as Somasundara Jayanandasūri of Tapagatchha was his guru or preceptorⁿ |

Somasundara was an intelligent pupil so he mastered the sciences within a few years and came to be known as Upadhyaya or Vachaka in A. D. 1393-4.ⁿ By this time he had earned name and fame as a scholar and was therefore given a rousing reception by the ministers Ramadeva and Ohunda when he went to Devakulapataka (or Devagiri).ⁿ

In A. D. 1400-01, the dignity of Acharya or Doctor was conferred on Somasundarasūri by Devasundarasūri in Anabilavada. To celebrate this occasion Narasimha Seth held a festival. Thus Somasundarasūri became the head of Tapagatchha, at the age of twenty-seven.ⁿ

In Vadansgara there were three wealthy Jain brothers named Devaraja Hemaraja and Ghatsalimha. When Somasundarasūri conferred the dignity of Upadhyaya on Munisundara, Devaraja held a festival with the consent of

(71) Somasūri, *Somasambhāgyakāvyā*, cantos II, III, IV (72) *Ibid.*, V 11 & 14.

(73) Desai, *Jain Sahitya no Itihasa*, p. 452.

(74) Somasūri, *Somasambhāgyakāvyā*, V 51-51.

his brothers Then he became the head of a congregation and went on a pilgrimage to Satrunjaya and Giranāra in the company of Munisundara ⁷⁵

In Idar, there was a rich man named Vatchharāja who belonged to Ukeśakula He won name and fame in the state by his excellent character and many donations He had, by his wife Rānī, four sons named Govinda, Visala, Krurasimha and Hiro Govinda built Ādinātha's temple in Idar, Visala took up his abode in Deulavataka and married Khimāī, a daughter of Ramadeva by his wife Melade Ramadeva was a minister of Mewada; so Visala commanded influence at Court and became an apple of king Lakha's eye. He made pilgrimages to the holy places of the Jains, erected temples, and like his father, helped the people in times of famine He was a patron of learning and the learned At his expense, ten copies of Gunaratnasūri's *Kṛyāratnasamutthaya* were made ⁷⁶

Govinda, son of Vatchharāja and brother of Visala, brought marble from Ārāsura and repaired

(75) Ibid, VI, 18 to 57

(76) Peterson, VI, 17-19, Prasasti to the *Kṛyāratnasamutthaya*, A D 1411-12 This Visala had built a temple to Sreyāsanātha in Chitoda

Kumarpala's temple on the Taranga hill. A great festival was held on this occasion. Persons from far off places were invited to grace the occasion. Pratishtha or the ceremony at the time of setting up the image in the garbhagriha was performed by Somasundarasūri. As Govinda was a favourite of Punjrao king of Idar Idar's warriors guarded the congregation on the Taranga hill. A Jain Bania named Sakanhada earned name and fame on this occasion by his generous donations."

According to a manuscript in the Forbes Gujarati Sabha Bombay the ceremony of setting up the image was performed in A. D 1422-23."

About this time Somasundarasūri conferred the dignity of Vachaka or Upadhyaya on Jinamandana and that of Acharya or Doctor on Bhuvanasundara Vachaka.

When Somasundarasūri came to Karnavati Gujaraja a favourite of king Ahmad Sheh gave him a rousing reception and held a festival. He belonged to Uketavamba. His great-grandfather Visala had a son named Dodo. Dodo's

(77) Somasundara, *Somasaṃbhāṣya*, canto. VII.

(78) Catalogue of Manuscripts Forbes Gujarati Sabha p 224.

son Dhanapala made Karnāvati his domicile of choice. He had four sons—Sāngana, Godo, Samaro and Chācho. Chācho was well-known in Karnāvati. He made pilgrimages to the holy places of Jains and built a Jain Temple. He had two wives—Lādi and Muktadevi. By his wife Lādi, he had three sons—Vijada, Samala and Puno. By Muktadevi, he had four sons named Gunarāja, Āmbāka or Āmbra,⁷⁹ Līmbāka and Jayanto. Of these four brothers, Gunrāja, who gave a rousing reception to Somasundarasūri, was very well-known. He had access to king Ahmad Shah and was his favourite Jeweller. He was a staunch Jain and went on pilgrimage to Satrunjaya and Giranāra in A D 1400-01 and A D 1405-6. In A D 1408-9, his younger brother Āmbāka or Amba who had entered the order of Jain monks, became Vāchaka or Upadhyāya. In A. D 1411-12, he helped the famine-stricken persons. In A. D 1413-14, he went on a pilgrimage to Sopāraka, Jirāvally and Mt Abu. His third pilgrimage to the holy Satrunjaya hill was undertaken in A D 1420-1. The Jains of far off places were invited. King

(79) According to the *Somasaubhāgyakāvya*, Vāva was the father of Amra (VIII, 19) His second name was probably Chācho

Ahmad shah was well-disposed to Gunaraja so he honoured him on this occasion by giving him presents sending his warriors to guard the pilgrims to the holy hill, and by placing his resources at the disposal of Gunaraja to make the pilgrimage a great success.⁸⁰

Somasundarasūri had accompanied Gunaraja⁸¹ in this pilgrimage of A.D. 1420-1.

On the way the pilgrims halted at Dhandhuka Valabhipura, Madhumati (or Mahuva) Devapattana (or Prabhāsapattana) Mangalapura (or Mangrol) Junagadha and other places. At Mahuva, the dignity of Ācharya was conferred on Jināsundara Vachaka by Somasundarasūri. From Girānra, Gunaraja returned to Karnavati and after a few years repaired the temple of Mahaviraswami at Ohitrakuta or Ohitoda. As he lived at

(80) This Gunarāja had five sons—Gaja, Mahiraja, Bala, Kālu and Ishvara and a wife named Gangādevī. Mahirāja died in youth, Bala took up his abode at Ohitrakuta or Ohitoda and was much honoured by the king. Gunarāja's brother Ambaka had a son named Manuka. Besides Manuka, Gunarāja had a nephew named Jinaraja.—Prasasti to Mahāvīraprasāda at Ohitrakuta.—*Dossal, Loc. Cit., p. 455 f. n.*

(80A) *Somasambhāgyakāya*, VIII 24-31; Prasasti to Mahāvīraprasāda at Ohitrakuta.

Karnāvatī, his son Bala, who had taken up his abode at Chitrakuta, was appointed to supervise the work. When the temple was re-built, Gunarāja's five sons set up the image of Mahāvīraswami and the 'Pratishtha' was performed by Somasundarasūri in A. D. 1428-9⁸¹

When Somasundarasūri paid the third visit to Devakulapataka, he conferred the dignity of Vāchaka on Visalarāja. To celebrate this occasion, Visala held a festival. On another occasion, when Somadevasūri conferred the dignity of Āchārya on Jinakīrti, Visala's son Champaka held a festival.

The following were some of the religious deeds of Somasundarasūri —

(i) Pratishtha of Nandisvarapata in Ādinātha's temple at Devakulapataka in 1428-9.

(ii) Pratishtha of Ādinātha's image, prepared by Mahallade, at Devakulapataka.

(iii) Pratishtha in the Tribhuvanadipaka or Dharana Shah's temple at Ranakapura, in A. D. 1439-40.

(iv) Pratishtha of three images in Bala's temple, near Kīrtistambha, at Chitrakuta.

(81) *Somasaubhāgyakāvyā*, VIII, 45-92, Prasasti to Mahāvīraprāsāda at Chitrakuta, Desai, Loc. Cit., 455 f. n.

(v) Pratishtha of the image of Santinatha in Vija Thakur's temple at Kapilapatakapura.

(vi) Samarasimha Soni, a favourite of Ahmad Shah of Ahmedabad, rebuilt Vastupala's temple on Giranara at the Śūri's suggestion.

(vii) Pratishtha in the Chaturmukh Jinalaya of Lakshoba at Giranara

(viii) Pratishtha of the brass images of twenty-four Tirthankaras prepared at the expense of Munta.

(ix) Accompanied Śrinatha of Anahilavada in his pilgrimage to Satrunjaya and Giranara

(x) Advised Mahanasiimha Sanghapati to build a Jain temple

(xi) Copies of eleven principal Jain Agamas were prepared with the advice and assent " of the śūri.

(xii) Conferred the dignity of Acharya on Ratnasekhara Vachaka

(xiii) Advised his devotees Sanghapati Manadana Vachha Parvata, Sanghapati Varbada Sanghapati Dungara, Kalaka Soni Madana Vira and Virupa to glorify Jainism."

(82) The religious deeds of Somasundarasuri mentioned above are based mainly on the *Soma-sukhogyatārya* (canto IX).

After serving Virasāsana for several years, Somasundarasūri died in A D 1442-43.

In the Soma-Saubhāgya Yuga, books written on palm-leaves were copied on paper. This work was undertaken by Devasundara, Somasundara and Jinabhadrasūri of Tapagatchha. Among the prominent Jains who financed this work were Parvata of Cambay and Mandalika of Sanderā.⁸³

We shall now consider the literary activities of the Jains in what is aptly called the Soma-sundarayuga.

Gunaratnasūri, a co-student of Somasundarasūri, composed the *Kalpāntaravāchya* in A D 1400-01 and wrote commentaries on the *Saptatikā* (A. D 1402-3), Devendrasūri's *Karmagranthas*, *Aturpratyākhyāna*, *Chatuhsarana*, *Samstāraka*, *Bhaktapariṣṇā*, Somatilaka's *Kshetrasamāsa* and *Navatattva*. His two great works are the *Kriyāratnasamutthaya* and the *Tarkarahasya-dīpikā*.⁸⁴

Munisundarasūri, a pupil of Somasundarasūri, had a wonderful memory. At an early age of

(83) Desai, Loc. cit., pp 459-60

(84) Peterson, VI, 42, Velankara, No 1622, Buhler, VIII, No 394, Desai, Loc. cit., pp 462-3.

(v) Pratishtha of the image of Santinatha in Vija Thakur's temple at Kapilapitakapura.

(vi) Samarasimba Soni a favourite of Ahmad Shah of Ahmedabad rebuilt Vastupala's temple on Giranara at the Sūri's suggestion.

(vii) Pratishtha in the Chaturmukh Jinalaya of Lakshoba at Giranara.

(viii) Pratishtha of the brass images of twenty-four Tirthankaras prepared at the expense of Munta.

(ix) Accompanied Srinatha of Anahilavada in his pilgrimage to Satrunjaya and Giranara.

(x) Advised Mahendrasimba Sanghapati to build a Jain temple.

(xi) Copies of eleven principal Jain Agamas were prepared "with the advice and assent" of the sūri.

(xii) Conferred the dignity of Acharya on Ratnasekhara Vachaka.

(xiii) Advised his devotees Sanghapati Manadana Vachaka, Paryata, Sanghapati Narbada, Sanghapati Dungara, Kalaka Soni, Madana Vira and Virupa to glorify Jainism."

(83) The religious deeds of Somasundarasuri mentioned above are based mainly on the *Somasundarasuriya* (canto IX).

Bhuvanasundarasūri, pupil of Somasundarasūri, composed the *Mahāvīdyā* with commentary, the *Laghumahāvīdyā* and the *Vyākhyānadīpikā*.⁸⁸

Devaratnasūri, pupil of Jayanandasuri, was a Porvād Bania of Anahilavāda. Chāmpasi Pethada was his great grand-father. Devaratnasuri's father's name was Karaniga and mother's name Kuligade. Before he became a Jain monk, he was known as Jāvada. With his parents, Jāvada entered the order of Jain monks in A.D. 1411, at an early age of five. The dignity of Acharya was conferred on him in A.D. 1441. His contribution to literature was indirect.⁸⁹

Jinakīrtisūri, pupil of Somasundarasūri, wrote a commentary on the *Namaskārastava* and composed the *Uttamakumāracharita*, *Srīpālāgopālākathā*, *Champakasresthikathā*, *Panchajñastava*, *Dhanyakumāracharita*, *Dānakulpadruma*, (A.D. 1440-41) and the *Srāddha-Guṇasangraha* (A.D. 1441-2).⁹⁰

88 Velankara, No. 1056, Desai, Loc. cit., pp. 465.

89 *Jain Atithāsik Gurjarakāvyaśaṅkhya*, pp. 160-9.

90 Buhler, II, No. 292 and VI, 730, Peterson, I, No. 244, Velankara, No. 1761, Manuscripts in the Gulabkumar Library, Calcutta, Nos. 14-16, Buhler, VI, No. 675.

fourteen he composed the *Travidyagocitha*. Among his other works may be mentioned the *Tridasatarangina* the *Adhyātmakalpadrūpa-Sāntarasabhāvana* the *Upadeśaratnākara*, the *Jinastotraratnakosa* the *Jayānandaśharita* the *Sāntikarastotra*, the *Sivandharastuti* the *Patshik-sattori* and the *Angulasattari*.

When there was an epidemic at Dehavada he composed the *Santikarastotra* and warded off the evil. At Sirohi, when he removed the difficulties of the peasants the king being pleased with him prohibited hunting and proclaimed "amari," thereby asking his subjects to refrain from taking the lives of innocent animals. Jaffarakhāna or Dufarakhāna the Nalk or headman of Cambay had conferred on Munisundarasūri the title of "Vadi Gokulsankata."

Jayachandrasūri, another pupil of Somasundarasūri, was a very learned man. His bruds were Krishna-Sarasvatī and "Krishna-Vagdevatī. He was the author of the *Pratyādhyaśāna-vivaraṇa* the *Samyaktva-Kaṇṇadī* and the *Pratibramanavidhī* (A. D. 1448-50)†

(85) Velankara Nos. 1573 and 1500; Desai, Loc. cit. pp. 464-5.

(86) *Somasūbhāgyatārya*, X, 2-3; *Gurugunarāṭha-kara* 67-71; Oza, *Rajputanaka Itihāsa*, p. 500, l. n. 2.

(87) Peterson IV 107; *Jain Śaṅkhyano Itihāsa*, 484.

Bhuvanasundarasūri, pupil of Somasundarasūri, composed the *Mahāvīdyā* with commentary, the *Laghumahāvīdyā* and the *Vyākhyānadīpikā*.⁸⁸

Devaratnasūri, pupil of Jayanandasuri, was a Porvād Bania of Anahilavāda Chāmpasi Pethada was his great grand-father Devaratnasuri's father's name was Karaniga and mother's name Kuligade Before he became a Jain monk, he was known as Jāvada With his parents, Jāvada entered the order of Jain monks in A.D. 1411, at an early age of five The dignity of Acharya was conferred on him in A.D. 1441. His contribution to literature was indirect.⁸⁹

Jinakīrtisūri, pupil of Somasundarasūri, wrote a commentary on the *Namaskārastava* and composed the *Uttamakumāracharita*, *Sripālagopālakathā*, *Champakasresthikathā*, *Panchajñastava*, *Dhanyakumāracharita*, *Dānakalpadruma*, (A.D. 1440-41) and the *Srāddha-Gunasangraha* (A.D. 1441-2)⁹⁰

88 Velankara, No. 1056, Desai, Loc cit, pp 465.

89 *Jain Atīhāsik Gurjarakāvya-samgraha*, pp 160-9.

90 Buhler, II, No 292 and VI, 730, Peterson, I, No. 244, Velankara, No 1761, Manuscripts in the Gulabkumar Library, Calcutta, Nos 14-16, Buhler, VI, No 675.

Ratnasekharasūri pupil of Somasundarasūri composed the *Shaddāśyaśaśruti Śhrāddhapaśikramanasūtra vṛtti Vīdhikāumudī, Aśharapaśdīpa* and the *Prabodhachandrodayavṛtti*. At an early age he defeated the Vādīs of the decans in debates. He was given the title of *Balasarasvatī* by a Brahmin named Bahl.⁹¹

Manikyaśundara pupil of Merutungaśūri of Ānchala gacchha composed the *Chakrapāra Champu Śrīdharaśharita* (1406-7 A. D.) *Sukarjyakathā Dharmadattakathānaka Gṇanāśharita* and the *Malayāsundarikathā*.⁹²

Manikyaśekharasūri, another pupil of Merutungaśūri of Ānchala gacchha composed the *Kalpanāśyukta Avāśhara Avāśyaka Nīryukta Dīpikā Pīṇa Nīryukta Dīpikā Oḡha Nīryukta Dīpikā Uttarādhyāyana Dīpikā, Aśharāṅga Dīpikā* and the *Navatattvavivaraṇa*.⁹³

Devamurti Upādhyaya, pupil of Devaśhandraśūri of Kaśadraba gacchha, composed the *Vikramāśharita*, a work in fourteen cantos.⁹⁴

91 *Jana Śaktiyāna Itihāsa* p. 466.

92. *Ibid.*, p. 467

93 Buhle VII N 10 and VIII Nos. 373 and 339

94 Desai *Loc. cit.*, p. 467

Harshabhushana, pupil of Harshasena of Tapa-
gatchha, composed the *Srāddhavidhivinīśchaya*,
Anchalamatadalana and *Paryushanā-vichitra* (A.
D. 1429-30)⁹⁵

Jinasundara, pupil of Somasundarasūri, composed
the *Dīpālikākalpa* (A. D. 1426-7)⁹⁶

Charitrasundaragani, pupil of Ratnasimhasūri
of Brihad Tapagatchha, composed the *Siladuta*, the
Kumārāpālacharita, the *Mahāpālacharita* and the
Āchāropadeśa The *Siladuta* deals with Sthuli-
bhadrā's glorious conquest over cupid and
contains 131 verses The *Kumārāpālacharita*
was composed at the request of Subhachandra-
gani. It deals with the life of Parmārhat
Kumārāpāla, the Chaulukya king of Anahilavāda,
and contains 2032 verses It is one of the rare
historical works in Sanskrit⁹⁷

Rāmachandrasūri, pupil of Abhayachandrasūri
of Purnimāgatchha, composed the *Vikramacharita*
in Darbhikāgrama or Dabhoi, in A. D. 1433-4
and the *Panchadandātāpātrachhatraprabandha*
in Cambay in A. D. 1444⁹⁸

95 Kāntivijaya, Baroda, No 1016, Kielhorn, II,
No 360 96 Kāntivijaya, Baroda, No 1015

97 Buhler, II, No 316, Desai, Loc cit, P 469.

98 Velanakara, No 1746, Weber, No 1580

Subhasilagani pupil of Munisundarasūri of Tapagatchha composed the *Vikramacharya* in A. D 1433-4 the *Prabhāvakabāha* in A. D. 1447-8 the *Kāthā* in A. D 1452-3 the *Batrunyaya-kalpavṛtti* in A. D 1461-2 and the *Unādināmamālā*. According to the *Prabhāvaka Kathā* of our author Visalarāja, Ratnasekhara, Udayanandi, Charitraratna, Lakshmisagara, and Somadeva were the pupils of Munisundarasūri."

Jinamandanagani pupil of Somasundarasūri, composed the *Kumārāpālāprabandha* in A. D. 1435-6 the *Srāddhagunasangraha Vivarana* in A. D 1441-2 and the *Dharmaparikāṣa*.⁹⁹ The *Kumārāpālāprabandha* one of the historical works in Sanskrit is a good compilation.

Charitraratnagani, pupil of Jinasundarasūri, composed the *Mahaviraprasada-Prasasti* or the *Ohitrakutaprasasti* in A. D 1438-9 and completed the *Dasaapradīpa* in Ohitrakuta or Ohitor in A. D 1442-3 "

99 Petersen IV 110; *Jain Sahitya Itihas* PP 469-70

100 V Iankara, Nos 1703-2; Mitra's Report of Manuscripts VIII 233; Ātmānanda Jain Sabha Bhavnagar (Publication No. 67)

101. Ātmānanda Jain Sabha, Publication No. 66.

Jinabharsha, pupil of Jayachandrasūri, composed the *Vastupālācharita*, in A. D. 1440-1, the *Ratnasekharakatha* in Prākṛit in Chitrakuta, the *Vimsatisthānaka Vichārāmṛita-Sangraha* in Sanskrit and Prākṛit and the *Pratikramanavāḍhī* in A. D. 1468-9 ¹⁰²

Kirtiraja Upādhyaya composed The *Nemināthamahākāvya* in A. D. 1438-9 It is a work in twelve cantos ¹⁰³

Dhirasundaragani, pupil of Amarasundara, composed the *Avachurnī* on the *Āvasyaka-niryukti* ¹⁰⁴

Somasundarasūri composed the *Avachurnis* on the *Saptatī* and the *Āturapratyākhyāna* Besides these avachurnis, he also composed the *Ashtādasastav*, in A. D. 1440-41 He had many pupils ¹⁰⁵

Jinabhadrasūri of Kharatara-gatchha rendered "glorious and meritorious" services to Jinasāsana by asking the Jains to build temples at Giranāra, Chitrakuta, Mandavyapura and other places, and by opening libraries at Jesalmer, Jabalipura, Devagiri, Nāgora, Mandavagadha, Karnavati and

102 Bhandarkar Institute, Poona, No 171, Peterson, IV, 111, Peterson, I, 112 103 The work is published in the Yasovijayajī Granthmālā, Bhāvnagar. 104 Motilāl Bhandar, Pālitāna 105 Weber, No 1862, Buhler, IV, No. 124

Subhamāgani pupil of Munisundarasūri (Tapagatobha composed the *Vikramacharita* in A. D. 1483-4 the *Prabhāvakattha* in A. D. 1447-8 the *Kathakota* in A. D. 1452-3 the *Satrūnyaya-bālpavritti* in A. D. 1461-2 and the *Uddānāmamālā*. According to the *Prabhāvakattha* of our author Visalarāja, Ratnasekhara, Udayanandī, Charitraratna, Lakshmisagara, and Somadeva were the pupils of Munisundarasūri."

Jinamandanagani, pupil of Somasundarasūri, composed the *Kumārāpālāprabandha* in A. D. 1436-6 the *Sraddhagunānāgraha Vīracāra* in A. D. 1441-2 and the *Dharmaparibhāṣā*.⁹⁹ The *Kumārāpālāprabandha* one of the historical works in Sanskrit is a good compilation.

Charitraratnagani, pupil of Jinasundarasūri, composed the *Mahāvīraprasāda-Prasasti* or the *Ohitrakutaprasasti* in A. D. 1438-9 and completed the *Danapradīpa* in Ohitrakuta or Ohitor in A. D. 1442-3.¹⁰⁰

99. Peterson IV 116; *Jain Sahityaśiṅgha*, pp. 469-70

100. Velankara, Nos. 1708-9; Mitra's Report of Manuscripts, VIII, 253; Ātmānanda Jain Sahitya Bhavanagar (Publication No. 57)

101. Ātmānanda Jain Sahitya Publication No. 66.

His pupil Dharmachandra wrote a commentary on Rajasekhara's *Karapuramanjari*.¹⁰⁹

Besides the monks, some Jains also served literature. Of these, Mandanamantri is very well-known. He was the son of Bāhda. He was a very learned man and patronised learning and the learned. He composed the *Sūrasvatamandana*, the *Kāvya-mandana*, the *Champuramandana*, the *Kūdambarimandana*, the *Chandraviṇaya*, the *Alankāramandana*, the *Sringāramandana*, the *Sangītamandana*, the *Upasargamandana* and the *Kavikalpadrumaskandha*. He was very rich.¹¹⁰

The following contribution¹¹¹ was made by the Jains to old Gujarati Literature, Prose and Poetry -

Prose

Name of the Author	Name of the work	Date and or place
(1) Manikyasūri -	<i>Prithvīchandra-Charita</i>	A. D. 1421-2

109 Velankar, Nos. 1798 and 1281, Bhāṇḍārakara, 3rd. report, No. 418-9; Kaira Sangha Bhandar manuscripts

110 *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, pp. 481-4. 111 Ibid, pp 486-7

Cambay He is known as the author of the *Jinasattariprakarana* (Prakrit) and the *Apavarganāmanāla*. He was much honoured by king Varasinha of Jessalmer and king Trambakadisa.¹⁰⁷

Jinevardhanasūri founder of the Pippalak branch of Kharataragatohha, wrote commentaries on Sivaditya's *Saptapadārtha* and the *Vagbhata-lankara*.¹⁰⁸

Jayasagaragani of Kharataragatohha composed the *Santi Jinālayaprasasti*, the *Prithvīchandra-rājaraśmīcharita* in A. D. 1446 in Palanapuri; the *Parvatanāvalīkātā* in Anahilavada, in A. D. 1416-7 the *Vignapti-Trīcani* in A. D. 1457-8 the *Tirtharājastavana Upasargakharastotravali* and the commentaries on Jinadattasūri's staves and the *Sandehadolavali* and the *Bhavaratnarāma*.¹⁰⁹

With the "advice and assent" of Jayasagaragani hundreds of books were copied on paper.

Jinasagarasuri pupil of Jinachandra of Kharataragatohha, composed the *Hamsavyākaraṇapadikhandikā* and the *Karapuraparakaranatīkā*.

106 Desai, *Jain Sahityaṃśa Itihāsa* p. p. 472-4

107 Bhandārakara's Repo & etc. of Sanskrit Manuscripts III No. 291, Weber's catalogue No. 1719 108 Kanti-vijaya Bareda No 29; Buhler IV No. 167; Desai, Loc. cit., pp. 474-5.

His pupil Dharmachandra wrote a commentary on Rajasekhara's *Karapuramanjari*.¹⁰⁹

Besides the monks, some Jains also served literature. Of these, Mandanamantri is very well-known. He was the son of Bāhda. He was a very learned man and patronised learning and the learned. He composed the *Sūrasvatamandana*, the *Kāvya-mandana*, the *Champuramandana*, the *Kādambari-mandana*, the *Chandravijaya*, the *Alankāramandana*, the *Śrīngāramandana*, the *Saṅgītamandana*, the *Upasargamandana* and the *Kavikalpadrumaskandha*. He was very rich.¹¹⁰

The following contribution¹¹¹ was made by the Jains to old Gujarati Literature, Prose and Poetry –

Prose

Name of the Author	Name of the work	Date and or place
(1) Manikyasūri –	<i>Prithvichandra-Charita</i>	A. D. 1421-2

109 Velankar, Nos. 1798 and 1281, Bhāndārakara, 3rd. report, No. 418-9; Kaira Sangha Bhandar manuscripts

110 *Jain Sahityano Itihasa*, p.p. 481-4. 111 Ibid, p.p. 486-7

- (2) Somasundarasūri--(i) *Upadeśamālā* A. D.
(Gujarati
Translation) 1428-9
- (ii) *Yogaśāstra* —
(Gujarati
Translation)
- (iii) *Shadāvarya* —
(Gujarati
Translation)
- (iv) *Ārādhana-* —
Patākā
(Gujarati
Translation)
- (v) *Narataṭṭva* —
(Gujarati
Translation)
- (vi) *Shaktiśāloka* - A. D.
(Gujarati 1459-60
Translation)
- (3) Munisundarasūri- *Yogaśāstra*- A. D.
Chaturth Prakash-1434-5
(Translation)
- (4) Jinanagarasūri *Shaktiśāloka* "
(Kharataragatohha) (Translation)
- (5) Dayasimbhagani (1) *Saṅgrasane*- A. D.
pupil of Ratnasimha- (Translation) 1440 1
suri of Brihad

Tapagatchha.	(11) <i>Kshetrasamāsa-</i> (Translation)	A. D 1472-3
(6) Hemahansaganī, pupil of Jayachandrasuri.	<i>Shadāvas'yaka-</i>	A. D. 1444-5
(7) Manika- Sundaraganī, pupil of Ratnasimhasūri of Vriddha Tapagatchha	Maladham Hemachandrasūri's <i>Bhavabhāvana</i> (Translation)	A. D 1444-5 Devakula- pataka

The works of the authors mentioned above throw considerable light on the Gujarati language of the 15th Century.

Gujarati Poetry

Author	Work	Date and or place
(1) Jayasekhara sūri	<i>Tribhuvana</i> <i>dipakaprabandha</i> or <i>Paramahansa-</i> <i>prabandha</i>	
(2) Hirananda- Suri, pupil of	(1) <i>Vidyāvilāsa</i> Pavado	A. D 1428-9

(6) Pupil of Devaratnasuri	<i>Devaratnasuri- Fāga</i>	A. D. 1442-3
(7) Māndana- srāvaka	<i>Siddhachakra- Sripālarāsa</i>	1432-3
(8) Gunaratnasūri-	(i) <i>Rishabharāsa</i>	—
	(ii) <i>Bharata- Bāhubali prabandha</i>	—
(9) Bhavasundara,- pupil of Somasundarasūri	<i>Mahāvira- Stavana</i>	—
(10) Sadhukīrti-	(i) <i>Matsyodara- Kumāra- rāsa</i>	—
	(ii) <i>Vikramacharita- Kumararāsa-</i>	A. D. 1442-3.
	(iii) <i>Gunasthānaka- Vichāra Chopāi</i>	—
(11) Champā	<i>Nalacharita</i>	—
(12) Tejavardhana	<i>Bharata- Bāhubalirāsa</i>	

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| (13) Mandaliḥa | <i>Pethada-
rāsa</i> | |
| (14) Sarvaṇandasūri | <i>Mangala-
Kalas'a-</i> | |
| (15) Jayavallabha
pupil of
Manikyasundara | (i) <i>Sūlakṣhadra-
Bāsaṭho</i>
(ii) <i>Dhaṇḍ
Anagāra-rāsa</i> | |
| (16) Ratnamandanagani,
pupil of
Somasundarasūri | (i) <i>Neminātha-
Navarāsa-
śloka</i>
(ii) <i>Nāra-
Nirāsa-
rāsa</i> | |
| (17) Jayasekhara | <i>Pratodha-
Okṣatamaṇi
Antaranga
Chopai</i> | A. D
1405-6 |

The following is the Jain contribution to Apabhramṣa Sahitya¹¹³ :—

Author	Work
(1) A Pupil of Jayasekharasūri	<i>Silasaṇḍhi</i>
(2) Hemasara	<i>Upadesasaṇḍhi</i>

- (3) A Pupil of
Visālarāja,
pupil of
Somasundarasūri. *Tapahsandhi*
- (4) ——— *Kesi-Gomaya
Sandhi*
- (5) ——— *Mahāvīracharita*
- (6) ——— *Mrīgāputrakulaka*
- (7) ——— *Rishabhadhavalā.
Rishabhapancha-*
- (8) ——— *Kalyāṇaka*

Service of Jinaśāsana was not the monopoly of Jain monks Jain nuns did render useful services, but unfortunately, their services are rarely recorded on the pages of history. A nun of this period, who attracted the attention of Ānandamuni of Osavamśa, was Dharmalakshmi Mahattara.¹¹² She was the daughter of an Osavamsi Soni, named Simha and Ramadevi of Trambavati or Cambay. Her name was Melai, but when she entered the order of Jain nuns at the age of seven, in A. D. 1434-5, she came to be known as Dharmalakshmi. Her preceptor was Ratna-

112 Desai, *Jain Saṁvatsaro Itihasa*, p. 485.

sunhasūri. Dharmalakshmi had received liberal education. The dignity of Mahattara was conferred on her in A. D 1444-5 when she was in her teens. She was a successful preacher. When she went to Mandavagadha she was much honoured by Mandana, Bhima, Maneka and others. She had many disciples chief among whom was Vivekashri.¹¹⁴

We shall now deal with Jain contribution to architecture in this period.

Pittalahara or Bhima Shah's temple on Mt. Abu was built by Bhima Shah. It is known as Pittalahara because the principal image in the temple is made of brass and other metals.

It is a mistake to suppose that this temple was built in V. S. 1525 (or A. D 1468-9). In an inscription of V. S. 1494 (A. D 1437-8) in the Digambara Jain temple and in another inscription of V. S. 1497 (A. D 1440-1) in Srimala temple there are references to this temple. Secondly there is an inscription of V. S. 1497 (A. D 1440-1) in the inner hall of the temple. Thirdly this temple which was repaired by mantri Sundara and mantri Gada in A. D 1468-9

113-114 *Jain Aśvādhāra Garjara Kūya Saṃhāra*—

must have been built at least fifty years ago. Fourthly, from the inscriptions of the rulers of Abu dated V S 1350 (A D 1293-4), V. S 1372 (A D 1315-6) and V S 1373 (A D. 1316-7), it seems there were only two Jain temples—Vimalavasahī and Lunigavasahī—on Mt. Abu. It is certain, therefore, that the temple was erected between A D 1315 and A D. 1437

The principal image in the temple is made of brass and other metals. It was set up by Gada and Sundara in A D 1464-9. From the lānochhana or sign of bull, it is certain that the image is of Ādinātha. It is about eight feet high and five and a half feet broad.

Another image in the temple that arrests our attention is the marble image of Ādinātha set up by Simhā and Ratnā in A. D 1468-9

The third worth-seeing image in the temple is that of Pundarikaswāmī. It has a 'rajoharana' or a brush to sweep the ground, a piece of cloth (muḥapatti) on the right shoulder and a loin cloth.

Besides these images, there are 87 marble images, 4 brass images, 7 standing images, one image of Gautamaswāmī and another of Amlukādevī

Chapter VII

Jainism in Gujarat in the later half of the 15th. Century

In A. D 1450 Maharana Kumbhakarna repealed the pilgrim tax which was collected from the Jain pilgrims on Mt. Abu.¹¹

In A. D 1451 King Mandalika of Junagadha proclaimed *amari* asking his subjects to refrain from taking innocent lives on the 5th, 8th and 14th days of the bright and black halves of every month. Before issuing this order he had proclaimed "*amari*" on the 11th (bright and black) day and *Amavasya* of every month.

In A. D 1452 a copyist named Lonkashah was not on good terms with Jain monks so with the help of his disciple Lakhamasbi, he

protested against the established Svetambara Jain faith. He believed in Jain Scriptures but was against idol worship. His work became very easy, because, by this time, the Muslim rulers who were deadly enemies of idol worship, had firmly established themselves in the land. Lonkashah took into confidence Pirozshah, a favourite of the ruling chief, who destroyed temples, and spread his faith. He did not enter the order of Jain monks, but advised others to do so. His followers are known as Sthānakavasī or Dhundhia.¹¹⁶

In A D 1453, Sānarāja, son of Sajjanasimha by his wife Kaulākadevi, built a temple of Vimalanātha on Giranāra.¹¹⁷ The Pratiṣṭha was performed by Ratnasimhasūri of Tapagatchha. In A D 1460-1, he made pilgrimages to Satrunjaya and Giranara. At his request, Gnānāsāgarasūri completed the *Vimalanāthacharita* in Cambay, in the same year.¹¹⁸

Laxmīsāgarasūri was a prominent Jain monk of this period. He entered the order of Jain monks in A D 1414, at an early age of six. His preceptor Munisundarasūri seems to have

(116) Desai, Loc Cit, p. 495.

(117-118) Desai, Loc cit p. 496.

trained him well for he pleased king Mahipala by winning victories in debates in Jirnadurga or Junagadha. Somasundarasūri conferred the dignity of Pandit on him in A. D 1436-7. On this occasion Mahadeva of Devagiri held a festival. In A. D 1444-5 when the dignity of Vachaka was conferred on him by Munsundarasūri in Mundasthala Sanghapati Bhimsa held a festival. In A. D 1460-1, Laxmisagarasūri became the head of his gachha. He worked for unity. Fortunately his efforts were crowned with success. In A. D 1465-6 he honoured the deserving monks of his Gachha by giving them titles.¹¹⁹ He died in A. D 1490-1.

The following were the pious and religious deeds¹²⁰ performed by various persons when Laxmisagarasūri was the head of gachha:—

(1) Salha of Ukejavansa set up a brass image weighing 120 mans at Dungarapura. He was a minister of King Somadasa.

(119) Somacharita Gurugunaratnābhāra, canto I

(120) The details given here are based on the Gurugunaratnābhārakāvya (cantos II, IV) completed by Somacharita in A. D 1454-5. Somacharita was a contemporary of Laxmisagara and a pupil of Chāritra-hansa wh was pupil of Somadevasūri.

(ii) Gadarāja mantri of Ahmedabad built a Jain temple in Sojitra at the cost of Rs. 30 000 The Pratishtha was performed by Somadevasūri. About this time, the dignity of Vāchaka was conferred on Subharatna.

(iii) Dhanyarāja and Nagarāja of Devagiri came to Gujarata, pleased King Mahmud, made a pilgrimage to the Śatrunjaya hill, served the Jains of Anahilavāda and held a festival, when the dignity of Sūri was conferred on Somajaya

(iv) Gadarāja mantri set up an image of Ādinātha weighing 120 mans in the Bhimavihara or ' Pitalahara ' on Mt Abu The Pratishtha was performed by Somajayasūri in A D 1468-9 On this occasion, the dignity of Ācharya was conferred on Jinasoma Vāchaka at Gada's request and that of Vāchaka on Jinahamsa and Sumati-sundara at the request of Dungara of Anahilavāda and Sanda of Abu

(v) Ishwara and Patta, ' Soni brothers of Ukeśavamśa, built a temple of Ajitanatha in Idar. The Pratishtha of the principal and other images in the temple was performed by Laxmisāgara in A D 1476-7 On this occasion, nineteen Jain monks were honoured

(vi) Ujala and Kāja went on a pilgrimage to

Jirapalli and stayed there for seven days in the company of Somadevasūri.

(vii) Moved by the sermon of Somajayasūri 84 couples took the fourth vow of a Jain layman, at Sirohi.

(viii) At the suggestion of Sumatisundarasūri, Sahasa son of Ohāllga built the Ohomukh Prasad on Mt. Abu.

(ix) Velaka and Dharmasimha built 'devakulikas' in the Ohomukh temple at Ranapura. After a pilgrimage to the holy Satrunajaya hill, they returned to Idar, gave cloth to 800 monks held a festival when Somasagara was honoured with the dignity of Vachaka and went on a pilgrimage to Parapura to pay their obeisance to Sambhavanatha.

(x) Ratna and Megha went on a pilgrimage to Jirapalli at the foot of Mt. Abu, with the Jain congregation and gave cloth to monks of Tapagatchha Vriddhasāli gatchha Nanagatchha Nanavali gatchha and other gatchhas.

Hemavimalasūri was a prominent pupil of Laxmisagarasūri. He was born at Vadagama in Marumandala or Mārwad on the full-moon day of Kartika in the Vikram year 1530 (A D 1463). His father's name was Gāngadhara and mother's name Ganga. Before he entered the

order of Jain monks, he was known as Hadaṛāja. In A. D. 1471, he renounced the world and accepted Laxmisaḡara as his guru. He was, however, trained by Sumatisadhusūri. In A. D. 1491, the dignity of sūri was conferred on him and he was made the leader of his gatchha. This occasion was celebrated by Sāyara Kothāri and Sahajapāla at Idar where the Jains of far-off places were invited.¹²¹

In A. D. 1493, he went on a pilgrimage to the Śatrunjaya Hill with the Jain congregation of Stambhatīrtha or Cambay. In A. D. 1495, he conferred the dignity of sūri on Danadhira, but unfortunately, the latter died in A. D. 1495-6.

In A. D. 1513-4, when the dignity of Āchārya was conferred on Ānandavimalasūri and that of Vāchaka on Dānasekharagaṇi and Māṇikasekharagaṇi by our Sūri, Soni Jivā Jāga of Cambay held a festival. In A. D. 1515-6, Himavimalasūri halted at Karpatavaṇiyya (Kapadavanja) on his way to Cambay. The Jains of Kapadavanja gave him a royal reception. Some envious persons reported the matter to the

(121) Hansadhira was a contemporary of Hemavimalasūri. The *Hemavimalasūri jāga* was completed in V. S. 1554 (A. D. 1498) *Jain Atīhasika Gurjar Kāvya Saṁhaya*, No. 16.

king whereupon the latter passed orders for the arrest of the Sūri. When the king's men came to arrest him, he ran away to Ohuneli, and from thence to Sojitra. From Sojitra the sūri went to Cambay where he was given a rousing reception. The royal servants coming to know of his arrival came to Cambay and arrested him. The Jain congregation had to pay 12 000 tankas before he was released. The sūri did not like this so a deputation consisting of Pandit Harshakulagani, Pandit Saughsharshagani, Pandit Kusalaayamgani and Kavi Subhasulagani was sent to Ohampakadurga or Ohampaner to wait upon the king. The deputation pleased the king by their skill in composing poems and induced him to pass orders to return the fine. In A. D. 1521-2 when the sūri went to Anahilavada, the Jains gave him a rousing reception. On this occasion Nākara Panchanana of Ukeṣavama took the fourth vow of a Jain layman and gave liberal presents to the Jain congregation. From Anahilavada, the sūri went to Vṛjapur and performed Pratiṣṭha in the temple built by Kothari Satara Sripala. In A. D. 1527 when he was at Visanagara the sūri found that his end was drawing near; so he sent for Anandavimāla who was at Vadala and asked

him to become Gatchhanāyaka or the head of gatchha. When Ānandavimala did not accept the post, Saubhāgyaharshasūri was made Gatchhanāyaka.¹²² Hemavimalasūri died at Visanagara in A. D. 1527, leaving behind him many pupils whom he had taken in the order of Jain monks.⁷²³

After Hemavimalasūri, Saubhāgyaharshasūri glorified Jainism. Though born in A. D. 1498-9, he entered the order of Jain monks at the early age of eight in A. D. 1506-7. When he became Gatchhanāyaka in A. D. 1527, Bhīmasi, Rupa, Devadatta, Kaba, Jayavanta and other Jains held a festival. In A. D. 1530, he went on a pilgrimage to Śatrunjaya and Giranāra with the Jain congregation. In A. D. 1533, a festival was held by Somasi, Ratnasi, Dakhamasi and Khimsi of Cambay to congratulate the Sūri upon his appointment as a Gatchhanāyaka. In A. D. 1540, the dignity of Vachaka was conferred on Somavimala at Vidyapura (or Vijapura). To celebrate this occasion, Teja Manga gave plates and sweet balls to the Jain congregation.

(122) Laghu Posalika Pattāvali, *Jain Atihasika Gurjara Kavya Sanchaya*, appendix, pp. 96-9

(123) *Jain Atihasika Gurjara Kavya Sanchaya*, Appendix, p. p. 98-9

In the same year a great festival was held at Idar. The Jains of 700 different places, 500 Digambara and 500 monks graced the occasion. Hoodreds of Jain images were set up at the hands of our sūri. In A. D. 1540 Sanbhagya harshasūri breathed his last leaving behind many pupils who mourned his death. He was succeeded by Somavimalasūri.¹²⁴

About this time three monks of Anchalagatchha rendered meritorious services to Virāsana.¹²⁵ Bhavasagarasūri 61st Pattadhara of this gatchha was born at Narasani in Marwad in A. D. 1453-4. His father's name was Sangani and mother's name Singarade. Before he entered the order of Jain monks he was known as Bhavada. Jayakeśarasūri admitted him to the order of monks in A. D. 1463-4. The ceremony was performed at Cambay. The dignity of Ācharya

(124) Ibid, Appendix p. p 99-100

(125) Th. 60th. Pattadhara of this gatchha was Siddhāntasāgara. His dates are as follows:—

Birth—V. S. 1506; Dīkshā—V. S. 1512; Ācharyapada V. S. 1541; Gatokhanāyaka-pada—V. S. 1543, Death. V. S. 1560. He was born at Anahilavāda. His father's name was Jāvada Soni and mother's name Puralade. *Jain Antikarsaka Garjana Kavya Samakaya*—Appendix p. 114.

was conferred on him at Mandala in A. D. 1503-4. He died in A. D. 1525-7.¹²⁶

Gunanidhanasūri, who succeeded him, was born at Anahilavāda in A. D. 1491-2 His father's name was Nagaraja and mother's name Lalādevi He was admitted to the order of Jain monks, in A. D. 1495-6, at an early age of four, by Siddhantasagarasūri When he mastered the sciences, the dignity of Āchārya was conferred on him in A. D. 1508-9 To celebrate this occasion, Dharana mantri of Srivamsa held a festival at Jambunagara or Jambusara In A. D. 1527-8, when Gunanidhanasūri became the Gatchhanayaka, Vijjāhara Shah of Cambay held a festival Our Sūri died in A. D. 1544-5.¹²⁷

We have dealt with Lonkashah a copyist who was opposed to idol worship He was followed by Bhāna of Sirohi, Jivaji and Varasinghaji They all started a campaign against idol worship and had the sympathy of the ruling chiefs who held similar views

Another difficulty in the work of Jain preachers was created by Kaduva, a Nāgara Bania of Nadulā In A. D. 1457, he came to

(126) Ibid, Appendix, p 114

(127) Ibid, p p 223-4.

Ahmedabad and came in contact with Panyas Harikirti who impressed upon him that it was useless to enter the order of monks as true preceptors were not found. Kadava accepted the advice of Harikirti and spread his views about A. D 1505. He believed in idol worship.¹²⁸

The third difficulty was created by Parvachandra Nagori a pupil of Sadhuratna of Tapāgatchha. He made many changes in the religious ceremonies and founded the Payachanda gatchha.

The fourth difficulty was created by Vallabhasahārya and other Vaishnava preachers.¹²⁹

To surmount these difficulties Ānandavimalasūri of Tapagatchha made strict rules for Jain monks and enforced them rigorously. He practised austere penance for 14 years and created good impression on the people. He permitted Jain monks to go to Jesalmere. On the whole his efforts were crowned with success.¹³⁰

(128) Desai, *Jain Sahitya Itihasa*, p. 510

(129) *Ibid* p. 510

(130) Ānandavimalasūri was born at Ida in A. D. 1490-1. His father's name was Megha and mother's name Man ka. He was kn wn as V ghakuvvara before he entered the order of Jain monks. Hemavimalasūri

Among the well-known temples of this period we may mention Kharataravasahi on Mt. Abu and Karma shah's temple on the Śatrunjaya Hill.

Many images in Kharataravasahi were set up by the Jains who belonged to Kharataragatchha; so the temple is called Kharataravasahi

It is a mistake to suppose that this temple was erected by the sculptors and masons who used the stones originally brought for Vimalavasahi and Lunigavasahi. It is not good to suppose that the stones brought for Vimalavasahi lay there for 200 years. The temple, moreover, does not seem to have been built 700 years ago.

In the inscription of Srimata's temple dated V S 1497 (A D 1440-1), there is a reference to Pittalahara but no reference to this temple. It seems, therefore, that this temple was built after A. D. 1440. It was probably built by Sanghavi Mandalika in A. D. 1458, because many images in this temple were set up by

admitted him to the order of monks in A. D. 1513-4. The dignity of Upādhyāya was conferred on him at Lalapura when Sanghavi Thira held a festival. He became a Śūri in A. D. 1525 and died in A. D. 1540. *Jain Atihasika Gurjara Kāvya Sanchaya*, Appendix, p p. 101-3

Mandalika and the members of his family about
A. D 1458

This temple is situated on a very high place and can be seen from a great distance. It has three storeys. It is a great pleasure to see the natural scenery of Mt.-Abu from the second floor of this temple. On the ground floor first floor and second floor there are "Chomukhs" or four images of the same Tirthankara in four different directions. Big and spacious halls are seen on the ground floor. Near the principal garbhagriha on the same floor there are many beautiful images of Tirthankaras. Jain monks Sravakas and Sravikas besides those of gods and goddesses.

There are two beautifully carved stone arches on the ground floor. On each arch, there are fifty-one images. There are also scenes from the life of Tirthankaras.

In A. D 1531 Karma Shah repaired Samart-Shah's temple on the Satrunjaya Hill. He was the son of Oasramsi Tola Shah of Chitor by his wife Lila. Tola Shah was a friend of King Sangramasingh or Sanga of Mewar.¹²¹ His son

(121) This Sangramasingh was the head of the Rajputs. He was defeated by Babar in the battle of Sikri in 1537 A. D.

Karmā Shāh was a well-known cloth merchant in Chitor. Once when Bahādura Shah, Prince of Gujarāt, paid a visit to Chitrakuta, he came to know Karmā Shah from whom he bought cloth. The Young prince liked Karmā Shāh and soon became his friend. When he wanted money to return to Gujarāta, Karmā Shāh gave him a lakh, unconditionally. In A. D 1526, Bahādura Shah became the king of Gujarāta. When Karmā Shah came to know this, he went to Ahmedabad where he was well-received by the King who returned the money lent to him and asked the Bania merchant if he could do anything for him. Thereupon Karmā Shāh requested Bahādura Shah to give him a 'firman' to repair the temple on the Śatrunjaya hill. The king granted his request and gave him the 'firman'. With this 'firman,' Karmā Shah went to Saurāstra. Mayādhāna or Muzahidādhāna, the governor of Saurāstra, did not like that the Jains should repair the temple on the Śatrunjaya hill, but as Bahādura Shah had given permission, the governor was helpless. Ravirāja and Nṛsiṃha two officers of the Governor of Saurāstra, helped Karmā Shah very much. A new image of Ādinātha was set up in A. D. 1531 when Vidyāmandanasūri, pupil of Dharmaratnasūri, performed pratistha. Vinaya-

mandana pathaks with his pupils and the Jains from far off places had come to Palitana to grace the occasion ¹²²

Adinatha's temple on the Śatrunjaya hill is kept in such a state of constant repairs that it is difficult to say how much of it is the work of Samara Shah or Karma Shah. The image of Adinatha that we see to-day in the garbhagriha was set up by Karma Shah. It is nearly six feet high. It is on a raised platform and is well-adorned. Near it, there are two standing and two other images in padmasana. Besides these four images of Tīrthankaras there are two images of guardian deities of Jainism with garlands of flowers in hand.

In the garbhagriha besides the principal image there are many images in big or small niches.

The prayer hall in this temple is very spacious and is supported on 28 pillars. On an elephant, Marudevīmata mother of Adinatha, who attained

(122) Jinavijaya, *Prashina Jain Lekha Sangraha*, II, Nos 1 2 3. The details about Karma Shah and his work are given in Vivekadhara's *Śatrunjayatīrthoddhāra-prabandha*. Vivekadhara was a contemporary of Karma Shah.

absolution before her son, is seated In the 'rangamandapa,' there are many niches containing the images of Tirthankaras The hall has doors on three sides. The floor is of marble

On the first floor, there is a 'Chomukhaji' and niches with images of Tirthankaras Most of the niches are beautifully carved.

The temple is entirely of stone

Pundarikaswami's temple is just opposite the temple of Ādinatha. It was erected by Karmashah in A D 1531. The image of Pundarikaswami bears an inscription in which it is said that the image was set up in A D 1531. In the garbhagriha, there are sixteen niches containing images of Tirthankaras. The sabhamandapa contains four cells. One of them is dedicated to Neminaṭha and the other to Ādinatha

Several scenes showing the main events of the life of Ādinatha and other Tirthankaras are found on the walls of the Sabhamandapa

The Rayana Paduka temple in the Adesvaratunka was also erected by Karmāshah in A. D 1531 It contains the feet of Ādinatha as well as an image of the same Tirthankara On the walls, there are scenes of Giranara and Mt. Abu.

mandana pathaka with his pupils and the Jains from far off places had come to Palitana to grace the occasion ¹²²

Ādinatha's temple on the Śatrunjaya hill is kept in such a state of constant repairs that it is difficult to say how much of it is the work of Samara Shah or Karma Shah. The image of Ādinatha that we see to-day in the garbhagriha¹ was set up by Karma Shah. It is nearly six feet high. It is on a raised platform and is well-adorned. Near it, there are two standing and two other images in padmasana². Besides these four images of Tirthankaras, there are two images of guardian deities of Jainism with garlands of flowers in hand.

In the garbhagriha besides the principal image there are many images in big or small niches.

The prayer hall in this temple is very spacious and is supported on 28 pillars. On an elephant, Marudevimata, mother of Ādinatha, who attained

(122) Jinavijaya *Prachina Jain Lekha Sangraha*, II, Nos 1 2 3. The details about Karma Shah and his work are given in Vivekadhara's *Śatrunjayatirthoddhara-prabandha*. Vivekadhara, was a contemporary of Karma Shah.

absolution before her son, is seated In the 'rangamandapa,' there are many niches containing the images of Tirthankaras The hall has doors on three sides The floor is of marble

On the first floor, there is a 'Chomukhaji' and niches with images of Tirthankaras Most of the niches are beautifully carved

The temple is entirely of stone

Pundarikaswami's temple is just opposite the temple of Adinatha. It was erected by Karmashah in A D 1531. The image of Pundarikaswami bears an inscription in which it is said that the image was set up in A D 1531. In the garbhagriha, there are sixteen niches containing images of Tirthankaras The sabhamandapa contains four cells. One of them is dedicated to Neminaatha and the other to Adinatha

Several scenes showing the main events of the life of Adinatha and other Tirthankaras are found on the walls of the Sabhamandapa.

The Rayana Paduka temple in the Adesvaratunka was also erected by Karmashah in A. D 1531 It contains the feet of Adinatha as well as an image of the same Tirthankara On the walls, there are scenes of Giranara and Mt. Abu.

The temple is situated under the shade of a 'rāyana tree and is therefore known as the rāyana pagala temple. It is a small cell and contains three stone arches.

Chakresvaridevi's temple in the Adevratunka was also erected by Karmashah in A. D. 1581. Chakresvarimata or the guardian deity of Jainism is seated on a tiger. She is richly dressed and profusely adorned. Outside the garbhagriha there are four images of four goddesses—Padmavati, Sarasvati, Nirvanidevi and Lakshmidēvi. Padmāvati bears the image of Pārśvanātha on the head and is seated on a cock. In her hands she holds a garland, a lotus and a trisula. Sarasvatidevi is seated on a goose and holds a harp and a book in hand. Nirvanidevi is seated on a lotus and holds a book, a bowl and a lotus. Lakshmidēvi is seated on a lotus and has a lotus in hand. These four images of the goddesses outside the garbhagriha belong to a later period.

The temple is entirely of stone. It is situated to the left of the entrance to Ādevratunka and as compared to the other temples on the hill, is very small.

In A. D. 1444-5 Taporatna and Gunaratna, pupils of Sadhunandana of Kharatara gacchha

wrote a commentary on the *Shasthisataka* of Nemichandra Bhandari¹³³ Taporatna composed the *Uttarādhyayana Laghuvritti*.

In A. D 1445-6, Parvata Srimali of Anahilavada copied many books at the suggestion of Jayachandrasuri of Tapa-gatchha¹³⁴

In A. D 1446-7, Somadharmagani, pupil of Chandraratnagani, composed the *Upadeśa-saptatikā*, which gives us an account of many holy places and historical persons. A Gujarati translation of this work is published by the Atmananda Jain Sabha, Bhavnagar¹³⁵

In A. D 1447-8, Somadeva, pupil of Ratnasekharasuri of Tapagatchha, composed the *Kathāmahodadhī* which contains 157 stories based on Harishena's *Karpuraparakā*. His other known work is commentary on Jinaprabhasuri's *Siddhāntastava* (A. D 1457-8)¹³⁶

In A. D 1447-8, Gunākarasuri of Chaitragatchha composed the *Samyaktvakaumudīkathā*. His other known work is the *Vidyasagarakathā*¹³⁷

(133) Velankara, Nos 1670-72.

(134) Desai, *Jain Sūhṛityāno Itihāsa*, p 513

(135) Peterson, I, 77, Buhler, IV, No 138.

(136) Velankara, No. 405, Peterson, I, 328

(137) Peterson, I, No 321

Oharitravardhana pupil of Kalyanasrja of Kharataragatohha composed the *Sindurasprakara* 137 at the request of Bhushanathakkura, in A. D. 1448-9 and a commentary on Kalidasa's *Raghuvamsha* at the request of Aradakamalla, son of Srimala Saliga.¹³⁸

In A. D. 1450-1 Udayadharma pupil of Ratnasimhasuri of Brihad Tapeगतह्हा, composed the *Vakya prakasa*. He is also known as the author of the *Sannatradasatatra*.¹³⁹

In A. D. 1453-4 Sarvasundarasuri pupil of Gunasundara of Maladbari गतह्हा, completed the *Hansaraja Vatsarajaharita* at Devapattana and Megharaja wrote a commentary on the *Vitaragastatra*.¹⁴⁰

In A. D. 1455-6 Sadhusoma pupil of Siddhantaruchi of Kharatara गतह्हा, wrote a commentary on the *Pushpanidhi*. About the same time Jayakirtisuri's pupil Rishivardhana of Anchala गतह्हा composed the *Jinendratisaya panchanika*.¹⁴¹

(133) Kāntivijaya, Baroda, No. 1872; Petrosca, III 210

(139) Desai Loc. cit. p. 514.

(140) Ibid, p. 514.

(141) Ibid pp. 514-5.

In A D 1456-7, son of Hamira and grand son of Viradāsa wrote a commentary on the *Sanghapattaka* at an early age of sixteen In the same year, Dharmachandragani, pupil of Jinasagarasūri of Kharataragatchha wrote the *Sinduraprakarakāvya tikā* ¹⁴²

In A D 1457-8 Satyarāja, of Paurāmika gatchha composed the *Sripālacharita* In the same year, Hemahansagani, pupil of Charitraratnagani of Tapa gatchha, wrote a commentary on Udayaprabhasūri's *Arambhasiddhi*. In the following year i. e. A D 1458-9, the same author composed the *Nyayarthamanjushā* in Ahmedabad ¹⁴³

Gnanasagarasūri, pupil of Udayavallabhasūri, composed the *Vimalanāthacharita* in A. D 1460-1 ¹⁴⁴ In the same year, Ratnamandana-gani, pupil of Nandiratna, composed the *Bhoja-prabandha* or the *Prabandharāja* which deals with the life of Bhoja, King of Malwa, and throws some light on the history of Gujarat ¹⁴⁵

In A. D 1461-2 Subhasilagani, pupil of

(142) Gulābikumārī Library, Calcutta, Manuscript Nos 7-1 and 48-2 (143) Velankar, No. 76, Peterson, IV, 17. (144) A Gujarati translation of the work is published by Atmananda Jain Sabha, Bhavnagar. (145) Velankar, No 1754.

Munichandra or Munsundarasūri of Tapa gatahha, wrote the *Satrunjayabalpatāha* and Amara-chandra wrote avachuri on the *Upadeśavāda*. In the following year Sadhusoma wrote commentaries on Jinavallabhasūri's *Mahāvīracharīya*, the *Chāritrapanchaka* and the *Nandīvarastava*.¹⁴⁶

In A. D. 1467-8 Pratisthasoma composed the *Somasaubhagyakavya* which deals with the life of Somasundarasūri, and Rajavallabha, wrote the *Chitrasena-Padaśāntikāha* and the *Shodāśasyakacerit* (A. D. 1473-4). In A. D. 1472-3 the *Jalpananjari* was composed.¹⁴⁷

In A. D. 1474-5 Siddhasūri composed the *Rasavatarnana*. In A. D. 1478-9 Bhavachandrasūri, pupil of Jagachandrasūri of Purnimagatahha, composed the *Sāntināthacharīta* which deals with the life of Sāntinātha, the 16th. Tirthankara of the Jains.¹⁴⁸

In the same year the *Pratichandracharīta* was composed by Jayachandrasūri. In A. D. 1483-4 Subhasīlagani wrote the *Sāntināthacharīta* and in A. D. 1484-5 Siddhantasagara composed

(146) Desai, Loc. cit. p.p. 515-6.

(147) Ibid, p. 516.

(147A) Gulabkumārī Library Calcutta Manuscripts

the *Chaturvimsatīyīnastuti* and *Somachārītragaṇi* wrote the *Gurugunaratnākara* ¹⁴⁸

Sadhuvijaya, pupil of Jinaharsha, composed the *Vadavijayaprakarana* and the *Hetukhandanaprakarana* between A. D. 1488-9 and 1494-5. ¹⁴⁹

Subhavardhana, pupil of Sadhuvijaya, wrote the *Daśasrāvakaśārīta* in Prakrit about this time. His other works are the *Vardhamānadeśanā* and the *Rishimandalavṛtti* ¹⁵⁰

Jinamānikya, pupil of Hemavimalasūri, wrote the *Kurmāputraśārīta* in Prakrit ¹⁵¹

Kamalasamyama, pupil of Jinasāgarasūri composed the *Uttarādhyāyanasūtravṛtti* and the *Karmastavavivaraṇa* (A. D. 1492)

Udayasāgara of Ānchalagatchha wrote a 'Dīpikā' on the *Uttarādhyāyanasūtra* in A. D. 1489-90, and Kirtivallabha, pupil of Siddhanta-

(148) The work is published by the Yasovijayaji Granthamala, Bhavnagar

(149) Manuscripts in the Kāntivijaya Bhandar, Baroda and Kesaravijaya Bhandar, Wadhwan

(150) Kāntivijaya Bhandar, Chhani, manuscript, Kaira Jain Sangha Bhandar Manuscript, Velankar, No. 1797

(151) Peterson, III No. 588

sāgarasūri, wrote a commentary on the same work in A. D 1495-6¹²¹

Indrahaṃsagani composed the *Bhuvanabhāṣa-
charita* (A. D 1497-8) the *Upadeśa-Kalpavalli*
(A. D 1498-9) and the *Balinarendrakatha*
(A. D 1500-1) Labdhisāgarasūri of Vṛddha-
Tapagatoḥha wrote the *Śrīpīṭakathā* in A. D
1500-1.¹²²

Siddhantaśara, pupil of Indranandisūri, com-
pleted the *Darśanaratnākara* in A. D 1518-4. In
the following year Anantaḥaṃsagani pupil of
Jinamanikyā composed the *Dasakūṭānta-
charita*. In A. D 1515-6 Vinayahansa pupil of
Mahimarātna, wrote a commentary on the
Dakṣaśālistasāstra. In A. D 1516-7 Somadeva-
sūri, pupil of Śimhadatta composed the *Saṃyaktva-
kaṇḍa* and Maheśvara completed the *Vichāra-
rasāyana-prakaraṇa*. The *Kuṇḍrapālapratibodha*
was composed in A. D 1518-9. In A. D 1519-20
Bauhhāgyanandisūri composed the *Mauṇaśālistā-
kathā*. In A. D 1520-1 Vidyaratna wrote the
*Kurṃdāputra-
charita*. In A. D 1521-2 the
*Vimala-
charita* dealing with the life of the well-
known builder of the Vimalavāsahī on Mt. Abu,

(121) *Jain Śaśṭhyano Itihāsa* p.p. 517-8

(122) *Ibid* p. 518.

was composed In A. D. 1522-3, Ganasāra completed the *Vichārashatṭrimśika* with a commentary, in Anahilavāda In A. D. 1526, copies of eleven Angas were prepared at the cost of Ansimha Rana of Srimālvamsa In the same year, Jinahansasūri composed the *Ācārāṅgasūtra Dīpikā* and Sahajasundara completed the *Ratnaśrāvaka-prabandha*. In A. D. 1526-7, Harshakulagani composed the *Sutra Kṛtāṅgasūtra Dīpikā*. His other works are the *Bandhahetrudaya-Tribhaṅgi* and the *Vāhyaprakāśatikā* In A. D. 1534-5 Hradaya-saubhāgya, pupil of Saubhāgyasāgarasūri, composed the *Vyutpattidīpikā* in Cambay, when Bahadura Shah was the king of Gujarat ¹⁵⁴

About this time, Laxmikallola composed the *Tattvāgama* and the *Mugdhāvabodhā* ¹⁵⁵

We shall now consider what contribution the Jains made to Apabhramsa Literature ¹⁵⁶ in this period.

Author	Work or Works
(1) Yasahkīrti	<i>Chandappaha Charita</i> (About A. D. 1464)

(154) Ibid, pp 518-20

(155) Velankar, Nos. 1397 and 1473.

(156) Desai, Loc, Cit, p. 520.

(2) *Simhasena*
or *Rajhu*

(i) *Maheswaracharya*
(ii) *Adipurana*
(iii) *Sripalacharya*
(iv) *Sammatagun-*
nihana

(8) *Jayamitra*

Srenivacharya

(4) *Devanandi*

Rohinidhanabhai

(5) ———

Suandhadasmikab

(6) ———

Pdapiab

(7) ———

Jinapurandarabhai

The following is the Jain contribution to
Gujarati Literature Prose and Poetry ¹⁷

Old Gujarati (Prose)

Author

Work

Manikasundaragani

Bharabhuvanā Sūtra,
(*Devakulapatsaka*
A. D 1444-5)

Hemahansagani

Shadavasyaba
(A. D 1444-5)

Visalaraja

Gantamapritokhā
(A. D 1448-9)

Samvegadova

Pindarivedha
(A. D 1456-7)

"

Aradyataputhika
(A. D 1427-8)

Dharmadevagani	<i>Shashthi'sataka</i> (A D 1458-9)
Amarachandra	<i>Kalpasūtra</i> (A. D. 1460-1)
Merusundara, pupil of	<i>Shadāvasyaka</i> (Mandavagadha, A. D. 1468-9)
Ratnamurti	<i>Śilopadesamālā</i>
"	<i>Pushpamālāprakarana</i>
"	<i>Kalpa-Prakarana</i>
"	<i>Panchanirgrantha</i>
"	<i>Karpuraprakara</i>
"	<i>Shashthi'sataka</i>
"	<i>Yoga'sāstra</i>
Dayāsimhagani	<i>Kshetrasamāsa</i> (A D. 1472-3)
Parśvachandra	<i>Tandulaveyāli-Payanna</i>
"	<i>Āchārāṅgaprathama skandha</i>
"	<i>Prasnavyākaraṇa</i>
"	<i>Āupapātika</i>
"	<i>Sutrakritāṅga</i>
"	<i>Jambucharita</i>
Samarachandra	<i>Samstaraka-Prakirṇaka</i>
"	<i>Shadāvasyaka</i>
"	<i>Uttarādhyayana</i>

Gujarati Poetry

Depala Sravaka	<i>Jāvada-Bhavada Rāsa</i>
"	<i>Rohinoya Chora Rāsa</i>
"	<i>Chandanabalāna Chopai</i>
"	<i>Srenika Rāsa</i>
"	(About A. D 1468)
"	<i>Jambunādina Panchabhara</i>
"	<i>Varnana (A. D 1464-5)</i>
"	<i>Ārdrakumāradhara</i>
"	<i>Samyaktva Bāra Vrata</i>
"	<i>Kulaka Chopai</i>
"	<i>Shulibhadra Kakhara</i>
"	<i>Shulibhadra Jaga</i>
"	<i>Tharatala Kunāra Bhāsa</i>
"	<i>Snāttrapuja</i>
Ratnakarasūri	<i>Ādinātha Janmābhishēka</i>
Sanghavināsa	<i>Sudaršana Sreshthina Rāsa</i>
"	<i>Prabandha (A. D 1445)</i>
Dhanadevaganī	<i>Surangābhūdhanā Nemijaga</i>
"	(A. D 1445-6)
Sanghakalaśaganī	<i>Samyaktva Rāsa</i>
"	(A. D 1448-9)
Ānandamunī	<i>Dharma-Laxmī Mahatāra</i>
"	(A. D 1450-1)
Asāita	<i>Hansavatsalatha Chopai</i>
Ratnasekhara	<i>Ratnachudardas</i>
"	(About A. D 1453)

Kalyānasāgara	<i>Viśi Viharamāna Jina Stuti</i>
”	<i>Agadattarāsa</i>
Rishivardhanasūri	<i>Nala-Davadanti rasa,</i> (Chitoda, A. D. 1455)
Matisekhara	<i>Dhannārāsa</i> (A. D 1457)
”	<i>Neminātha Vāsanta Fulada</i>
”	<i>Kuragadu Maharshi Rāsa</i> (A. D. 1480-1)
”	<i>Mayanarehāsatirāsa</i> (A. D 1480-1)
Jinavardhana	<i>Ilāputracharita</i>
”	<i>Dhannārāsa</i> (A D 1458)
Nvyayasundara	<i>Vidyāvīlāsa-</i> <i>Narendra Chaupai</i> (A. D 1460)
Malayachandra	<i>Simhasanabatrasi chopai</i> (A D. 1462-3)
”	<i>Simhalasimhakumāra Chopai</i> (A D. 1462-3)
”	<i>Devaraja-Vatsarajaprabandha</i> (A D 1462-3)
”	<i>Jambuswāmīrasa</i> (A D. 1459-60)
Rājatīlakaganī	<i>Sālībhadramunirāsa</i>
Brahmajinadāsa	<i>Harivamsarāsa</i> (A. D. 1463-4)
”	<i>Srenīkarāsa</i>

Brahmajñanadasa	<i>Yasodhararāsa</i>
"	<i>Ādinātharāsa</i>
"	<i>Karakandannarāsa</i>
"	<i>Hannanantarāsa</i>
	<i>Samakṣanārāsa</i>
Gnānasāgarasūri	<i>Jivabhavasthitarāsa</i> (A. D 1463-4)
Bhaktivijaya	<i>Ohitrasena-Padmāvatirāsa</i> (A. D 1465-6)
Petho	<i>Pārvanāthadasabhava Vīdhale</i>
Laxmiratnasūri	<i>Swapriya-Kumārārāsa</i>
Lakṣmāna śrāvaka	<i>Alakāṁṇa-Oharita-śāpāna</i> (A. D 1464-5)
"	<i>Chikugatnasāsa</i>
"	<i>Siddhāntarāsa</i>
Vatohha śrāvaka	<i>Mṛgānta-lekharāsa</i> (A. D 1466-7)
Gnānasāgarasūri	<i>Siddhachakra-Sripālarāsa</i> (A. D 1474-5)
Mangaladharmas	<i>Mangalabalaśārṇava</i> (A. D 1468-9)
Devakīrti	<i>Dhannasādhakārāsa</i> (A. D 1474-5)
Punyandi	<i>Rupatamālā</i> (Between A. D 1467 and A. D 1490)
Devaprabhaganī	<i>Kumārāpālarāsa</i>

Udayadharma	<i>Malayāsundarārāsa</i> (A. D. 1486-7)
„	<i>Kathābatrīsi</i> (A. D. 1493-4)
Vatchhabhandari	<i>Navapallava-</i> <i>Pars'vanāthakalas'a</i>
Sarvānyasundara	<i>Sarasikhāmanarāsa</i> (A. D. 1493-4)
Hemavimalasūri	<i>Mrigaputra</i> (Between A. D 1493 and 1513)
Lāvanyasamaya	<i>Siddhantachopai</i> (A D 1488-9)
„	<i>Sthulibhadra Ekaviso</i> (A D 1498-9)
„	<i>Gautama-Prītoḥha Chopai</i> (A D. 1498)
„	<i>Aloyanavinati</i> (A D 1505, at Vamaja, near Kalol, North Gujarat)
„	<i>Neminatha-Hamachadi</i> (A D. 1505 or 1507)
„	<i>Ravana-Mandodari Samvāda</i> (A. D 1505)
„	<i>Serisāpārsvastava</i> (A. D. 1505)
„	<i>Vairāgyavinati</i> (A D 1506)
„	<i>Rangaratnākara</i> <i>Neminātha-prabandha</i> (A. D 1507-8)

Lavanyasamaya

Surapriyabetaḥ rūpa

(A. D 1510-11)

at Cambay

"

Vimalaprabandha

(A. D 1512)

"

Sumatīśādhya vināyaka

(A. D 1511-12)

"

Devaraja-Vaśiṣṭharaja śloka

(A. D 1518-9)

"

Kaṭakaśāstra

(A. D 1518-9)

"

Antarīkṣa-parīkṣā

(A. D 1521-9)

"

Ekamraśāstra

(A. D 1522-3)

"

Balabhadraśāstra Ahmedabad,

(A. D 1522-3)

"

Yakobhadraśāstra Ahmedabad,

(A. D 1522-3)

"

Draḍhaprakāśa Saṁhita

"

Parvāyinaśāstra

"

Chaturvīṁśatyinaśāstra

Naraspati

Nanda Bātrus

(Non-Jain Poet)

(A. D 1488-9)

Munipati-Rajarahi Chanda

(A. D 1492-4)

Sāntisūri	<i>Sāgaradattarāsa</i> (About A D 1493)
Nannasūri	<i>Vichārachosathī</i> (A D 1487)
Samvegasundara	<i>Sārasikhāmana rāsa</i> (A D. 1491-2)
Simhakula	<i>Munipati Rajarshi Chopā</i> (A. D. 1493-4)
Kīrtiharsha	<i>Sanatkumārachopā</i> (A D. 1494)
A Pupil of Kakkasūri	<i>Kuladhvaja</i> <i>Kumārārāsa</i>
Kshamakalaśa	<i>Sundararājārāsa</i> (A D 1495)
„	<i>Lalitāṅgākumāra rāsa</i> (Udayapura, A D 1497)
Mulaprabha sadhu	<i>Gajasukumāla sandhi</i> (A D 1496-7)
Jayarāja	<i>Matsyodarārāsa</i> (A. D. 1496-7)
Sundararāja	<i>Gajasimhakumāra Chopā</i>
Dharmadeva	<i>Harischandrārāsa</i> (A D 1497-8)
Kusalasayama	<i>Haribalarāsa</i> (A. D. 1498-9)
Nemikunjara	<i>Gajasimharayarāsa</i> (A. D 1499-1500)

Labdhisagara	<i>Dhojabhujanga</i> <i>Kuñḍera chopai</i>
Harshakula	<i>Vasudeva chopai</i> <i>Dasamūrtika-bātrini</i>
— —	<i>Abhakula Anantakaya</i> <i>Panchatīrtha stotana</i>
Nannasūri	<i>Ajāputra chopai</i> (A. D. 1504-5)
Dharmaruchi	<i>Ajāputrarāsa</i> (A. D. 1504-5)
Dharmadeva	<i>Lalitanga-charita</i> <i>Kayavannachopai</i>
Ishvarasūri	(A. D. 1406-7) <i>Vantachūlarāsa</i>
Padmasagara	(A. D. 1508-9) <i>Svāmītrakṣṇārāsa</i>
Gnāna	(A. D. 1510-1) <i>Salībhadraravikala</i>
Dharmasamudra	(A. D. 1511-15) <i>Rukhādattachopai</i>
Lakshmana	(A. D. 1513-15) <i>Vatsaraja Devarāja rāsa</i>
Devakalasa	(A. D. 1514-5) <i>Malipāla rāsa</i>
Lavangaratha	(A. D. 1515-6) <i>Rukhādattarāsa</i>
Amipala	<i>Ratnasavarāsa</i>
Sahajāsundara	

Sahajasundara	<i>Sukarajasaheli</i> (A. D 1526-7)
"	<i>Ātmaraja rasa</i> (A. D. 1527-8)
"	<i>Paradeśirajanorasa</i>
Dharmasamudra	<i>Prabhākara-Guṇālaṅkāra</i> <i>Chopai</i> (A D 1517-8)
—	<i>Champalamālā rāsa</i> (A D. 1522-3)
Bhuvanakīrti	<i>Kalavati-charita</i>
Vinayasamudra	<i>Ārāmaśobhā</i>
Narasekhara	<i>Prabhāvatīharana</i>
Dharmasāgara	<i>Ārāmanandana</i> <i>Chopai</i> (A D 1530-1)
Samarachandra	<i>Srenikarāsa</i>
Sevaka	<i>Rishabhadeva-</i> <i>dhavalaprabandha</i>
Anandapramoda	<i>Sāntiyina vivāhalo</i> (A D 1534-5)
Somavimala	<i>Dhammilarāsa</i>
Brahma	<i>Susadhu chopai</i> (A D 1536-7)
	<i>Pratyekabuddha chopai</i> (A D. 1540)
—	<i>Kṛitakarmarājadhikārarāsa</i> (A. D. 1537-8)

Rajasula	<i>Anarasena-Vayarasena Chopai</i> (A. D 1537-8)
Kaviyana	<i>Tetalmantirida</i> (A. D 1538-9)
Vinayasamudra	<i>Ambada chopai</i> (A. D 1542-3)
Rajaratnasūri	<i>Haribala māchhi chopai</i>
Bhava Upadhyaya	<i>Harachandra rda</i>
Levanyamuni	<i>Nandabatin</i> (A. D 1491-4)
Jinahara	<i>Vikramapancha-dandardra</i>
Rajasula	<i>Vikramāditya Khopara-</i> <i>rda</i> (A. D 1508-7)
—	<i>Vikramasena rda</i> (A. D 1508-9)
—	<i>Purvadekachautyārda</i> (A. D 1508-9)
—	<i>Ilāprākārachautyaparipāthi</i> (A. D 1513-14)
Khima	<i>Satrūnjayachautyaparipāthi</i>
Gnānācharya	<i>Bīlkana Panchakāṭa</i>
"	<i>Sankalā panchakāṭa</i> "

(157) It is not possible to go into the details of the works mentioned above in a small work like this. They will be found in the *Jama Garjar Kavi, Part I*, by M. D. Desai, pp. 87 to 150

Chapter VIII

Hairakayuga



Kalikālasarvagna Hemasūri obtained partial success as a missionary at the court of Siddharāja and complete success at the court of Kumārāpāla who embraced Jainism and glorified it. His work was continued by Hīravijayasūri who attended the meetings at Ibādatakhaṇḍ and created in Emperor Akbar deep love for the Jain principle of Ahimsā or non-violence. Under Jain influence, Akbar gave up flesh and prohibited the taking of life for several months in a year. Under Hīravijaya's instructions, the Emperor performed many pious and religious deeds. For these reasons, the following sixty years in Jain History are known as the Hairakayuga.

Hīravijayasūri was born at Pālanapura in A. D. 1526-7. His father's name was Kurashah and mother's name Nāthibai. Sanghaji Suraji and

Śrīpala were Hīravijaya's three brothers and Rambha Rāni and Vimala were his sisters. When Hīraji was 13 years old, his parents died so his sisters Vimala and Rāni who lived at Anahilavada Patan took him there in A. D. 1539-40.

Vijayadanasūri admitted him to the order of Jain monks. On this occasion Ampala, Amarasimha, Kapura Ampala's mother Dharmashrishi Rudorishi, Vijayaharsha and Kanakashri entered the order of monks or nuns. Hīraji changed his name and came to be known as Hīraharsha¹⁵⁸

Hīraharsha was a very smart pupil, so Vijayadanasūri sent him to Devagiri in the Deccan for further studies. Dharmasagaraṇi and Rajavimala were also permitted to accompany him. Devasishah and his wife Jasmai gave the monks all the financial help they required in prosecuting their studies¹⁵⁹.

In A. D. 1550-1, the dignity of pandit was conferred on Hīraharsha at Nadlai in Marwad. In A. D. 1552 Hīraharsha became Upadhyaya. In A. D. 1554 the dignity of Suri was conferred on him, at Sirohi (Marwad) by Vijayadanasūri.

(158) Vidyavijaya, *Śūlīkaraṇa and Samant* pp. 20-4.

(159) *Ibid.*, p. p. 24-6.

On this occasion, Hiraharsha changed his name and came to be known as *Hiravijayasūri*. In A D 1566, Vijayadasūri died, so *Hiravijayasūri* became the head of the Jain community¹⁶⁰

After his preceptor's death, *Hiravijayasūri* had to surmount certain difficulties. Ratnapāla of Cambay, had by his wife Thakā, a son named *Rāmaji* who was not keeping good health. Ratnapāla, being sick of *Rāmaji*'s continued illness, once said to the *Sūri* that if *Rāmaji* recovered his health, he would make him the *Sūri*'s disciple. After some time, *Rāmaji* was completely cured, but Ratnapāla did not want to keep his promise; so when the *Sūri* reminded him of his promise, he picked up a quarrel with him and his daughter Agā instigated her father-in-law, Haradās, to complain against *Hiravijayasūri* to Sitābhkhana, Governor of Cambay. When the complaint was lodged, orders were passed for the arrest of *Hiravijayasūri* and the latter had to remain in concealment for a period of 23 days to avoid Suba's men.¹⁶¹

The second difficulty was created by Jagamālarishi, who complained to *Hiravijayasūri*

(160) Ibid , pp 24-6

(161) *Vidyavijaya, Surisvara and Samrat*, pp 27-9.

that his preceptor Karnarishi did not allow him to study some religious books. The sūri told Jagamala that Karnarishi must not have found him fit for study. Jagamala was, however, not satisfied with the sūri's answer so he picked up a quarrel with him. Thereupon the sūri drove him out of his gachha. Jagamala felt humiliated; so he lodged a complaint against Hiravijayasūri to the police officer Petlad. A warrant for the arrest of Hiravijayasūri was issued. The latter who was at Borsad succeeded twice in avoiding policemen but when they came for the third time the Jains bribed them and they no longer helped Jagamala who was forced to leave the place about A. D. 1573-4¹⁴

The third difficulty was created by Udaya-prabhasūri and other monks who complained to Kalakhana Governor of Anahilavada against Hiravijayasūri who was then at Kunagera, about five miles from Anahilavada Patana. Orders were passed for the arrest of Hiravijayasūri but the latter successfully avoided the policemen by running away to Vadavali where he had to remain in concealment for three months¹⁵

Rishabhadasa who records the above event

(152) Vidyavijaya, *Ibid.* pp. 20-20

(153) Vidy. 1/ya, *Saravara and Samvat* pp. 20-1

says that it took place in A. D. 1578; but as Kalakhana was the Suba of Patan upto A. D. 1575, it seems the event must have taken place before that date. It is also probable that Rishabhadāsa's date may be correct but he may have made mistake in recording the name of the Suba of Patan.

Hiravijayasūri had to face another similar difficulty at Ahmedabad in A. D. 1579-80. Some envious persons complained to Siḥabuddin Ahmadkhana or Siḥabakhana, Governor of Ahmedabad, that Hiravijayasūri had, by his magic powers, stopped rain. Siḥabakhana sent for the sūri and asked him why it did not rain and whether he had anything to do with it. The sūri made his position clear. When their conversation was going on, Kunvarji, a well-known Jain, came and explained Siḥabakhana the duties of Jain monks. The Suba was pleased to order the release of Hiravijayasūri. When the latter came to the monastery, the Jains celebrated this occasion of Sūri's release by giving away money in charity, but their joy was not to last long. A person named Tukadī poisoned the ears of the Kotwāla who complained to the Suba and obtained orders from him for the arrest of Hiravijayasūri, who was helped on this occasion, by Raghava and

Somasagara, and sheltered by Devaji, a Sthanakvasi Jain. Two innocent monks, named, Dharmasagara and Smtasagara, were arrested by policemen and subsequently released after sound beating because none of them was Hiravijayasūri.¹⁶⁴

In A. D 1580-1, the sūri went to Borad where the Jains held many festivals. In A. D 1582 he performed the pratistha when the image of Chandraprabhu was set up at Cambay by Sanghavi Udayakarna, who had led the congregation to Abu, Chitoda and other places. From Cambay Hiravijayasūri went to Gandhara.¹⁶⁵

Akbar had heard much about the reputation of Hiravijayasūri either from a Sevika named Ohampa or Itamadakhana and wanted to see him. He therefore called Bhanukalyana and Thanasingh Ramaji the Jain leaders, and asked them to write a letter to Hiravijayasūri inviting him to Fatehpur Sikri. The Emperor also wrote a letter to Shihabuddin Ahmadkhan or Shihabakhana, Governor of Ahmedabad asking him to send Hiravijayasūri to Fatehpura Sikri with royal honours. The letters were sent by the runners Maundi and Kamala.¹⁶⁶

(164) and (164A.) Vidyavijaya, *Loc. Cit.*, p. p. 31-4.

(165) *Jain Sakityana Itihas*, p.p. 339-40; Vidyavijaya,

Bharatvar and Samrat p.p. 75-80 81-2.

When the Governor of Gujarata received the Emperor's letter, he called the leading Jains of Ahmedabad and asked them to request Hiravijaya sūri to go to Fatehpura Sikri as desired by Akbar. The Jains told them that the Sūri was at Gandhara and that they would go there and inform him of the Emperor's letter¹⁶⁶

The Jains of Ahmedabad met and decided to send Vatchharaja Parekh, Mulo Sheth, Nana Vepu Sheth, Kuvaraji Jhaveri and a few others to Gandhara. At the suggestion of the Jain congregation of Ahmedabad, Udayakarana Sanghavi, Vajra Parekh, Rājia Parekh and Raja Srimalla Oswāl from Cambay went to Gandhara¹⁶⁶

Some Jains at Gandhara did not like that Hiravijaya should go to Sikri, but the others were in favour of sending him to the Emperor. After hot discussion, it was decided that the Sūri should accept the emperor's invitation and go to Sikri^{166B}

In A. D. 1582-3, Hiravijayasūri started for Sikri, from Gandhara, and went to Ahmedabad via Jambusar, Soptra, and Matar. Shihabkhan, the Suba of Ahmedabad, received him well, and offered him pearls, diamonds, horses, elephants

(166, 166A, 166B,), Vidyavijaya, *Surisvara*, and *Samrat*, pp 83-95

and palanquins. The sūri, however, did not accept anything but told the Suba that he would go to Sikri on foot. The Suba then wrote a letter to the Emperor in which he praised many good qualities of Hiravṛjyasūri and told the Emperor that the sūri had accepted his invitation.¹⁴⁶

From Ahmedabad the Sūri went to Anahilavada via Kadl Visnagara and Mehsana and stayed there for a week. From Anahilavada, the Sūri went to Sirohi via Sidhpur. The king of Sirohi gave the Sūri a rousing reception and gave up flesh, wine and hunting.¹⁴⁷

From Sirohi the Sūri went to Sikri via Falodi, Medata and Sanganer and reached his destination on the 19th day of the black half of Jetha of V S 1639 (A. D. 1583). The Jains of Sikri gave him a rousing reception. 67 Jain monks had accompanied the Sūri to Sikri.¹⁴⁸

The Sūri had put up at the place of Jaganmalla Katchhavyaha, younger brother of Biharimala, king of Jaipur and wanted to see Akbar on his arrival but as the Emperor was busy the Sūri was asked to see Abul Fazl with whom he had a very interesting conversation. When the Emperor was free he sent for the Sūri.¹⁴⁹

(166C 167 167A 167B) Vidyavijaya, *Saritarā and Samrat* p. p. 95-104; *Jain Sahityaśiṅkhā* p. p. 541 2.

Several stories are told about the intercourse of Akbar and Hīravijayasūri. According to the first story, when the Emperor came to know that the sūri had come to see him from Gandhār to Sikri on foot, he asked him whether the suba of Gujarat gave him horses, chariots and elephants for his journey. To this, the sūri replied that the Governor of Gujarat was willing to give him whatever he wanted, according to Emperor's orders; but his religion forbade him the use of vehicles. When the Emperor came to know the strict rules which Hīravijayasūri and his pupils followed, he was much pleased. The story is historical.¹⁶⁸

According to the second story, when the Emperor asked the sūri the names of the places of pilgrimage of the Jains, the sūri told him that they were Śatrunjaya, Giranāra, Mt Abu, Pārśwanātha Hill, Ashtapada, etc. There is nothing improbable in the story.¹⁶⁹

According to the third story, when the sūri refused to walk on the carpeted floor for fear of crushing the insects that might be on the floor, the carpet was removed under Emperor's orders.

(168) Desai, *Loc cit*, p 545, Vidyavijaya, *Surisvara and Samrat*, p 110

(169) Vidyavijaya, *Ibid* p 112

and to the surprise of all many ants were found under it.¹⁷⁰

According to the fourth story the sūri explained Akbar "Dovatatva" "Guru tattva" and "Dharmatatva" and laid great stress on the Jain principle of Ahimsa or non-violence. The Emperor was much pleased to hear the sermon and at the end requested the Sūri to accept the books given to him by Padmasagara, a Jain monk. The sūri was not willing to accept them, but did so at the repeated requests of Akbar and Abul Fazl. At Hiravijayasūri's suggestion, the books were kept in a library opened at Agra and named after Akbar. Thansingh a Jain, was appointed as the trustee of the library or bhandar.¹⁷¹

According to the fifth story several Jains of Agra went to Emperor Akbar and gave him Hiravijayasūri's dharmalabha or blessings. Akbar asked them if he could do anything for the sūri. Thereupon Ampala Doshi their leader told the Emperor that Paryushanaparva was drawing near and the Sūri wished the Emperor to prohibit the destruction of lives in those religious days. The Emperor then, gave a firman prohibiting the destruction of lives in Agra for eight days.¹⁷¹

(170 170A) *Jain Śaśūyano Itihāsa*, p.p., 545-8.

(171) Vidyavijaya, p. p. 121-2, *Dyaal Jain Śaśūyano Itihāsa*, p. 547

Once when Abul Fāz̤l and Hīravijayasūri were talking at Abul Fazl's place, Akbar came. Abul Fāz̤l, being much impressed by the Sūri, praised him very much. Akbar then requested the Sūri to accept something. The Sūri did not want anything for himself but when the Emperor requested him repeatedly, he asked him to give the imprisoned birds their liberty and to prohibit the destruction of lives for eight days of the Paryushanaparva throughout the Empire. Akbar, then, gave the birds their liberty and prohibited the destruction of living creatures for twelve days (instead of eight) throughout the Empire.¹⁷²

Akbar's regard for Jainism increased day by day. He remained under Jain influence for several years and listened to the sermons of Hīravijaya-sūri, Santichandra, Bhanuchandra and other Jain monks. He was convinced that it was bad to eat animal food. So he gave up meat for many days in a year. One of the principles of Din Ilahi was, "It is not meet that man should make his stomach the grave of animals;" and those who embraced Din Ilahi had to abstain from meat.¹⁷³

Ādinatha praśasti of Hemavijaya on the

(172) Vidyavijaya, *Surisvara and Samrat*, p. 124.

(173) Vincent Smith, *Akbar*, p. 335

Satrunjaya Hill dated A. D. 1593-4 says that Akbar prohibited the killing of creatures throughout his Empire for six months.¹⁷⁴ This is also confirmed by Badaoni who says—

His Majesty promulgated some of his decrees. The killing of animals on the first day of the week was strictly prohibited because this day is sacred to the Sun also during the first eighteen days of the month of Farwardin, the whole of the month of Aban (the month in which His Majesty was born); and on several other days... This order was extended over the whole realm and punishment was inflicted on every one who acted against the command.

Many a family was ruined and his property was confiscated. During the time of these fasts the Emperor abstained altogether from meat as a religious penance gradually extending the several fasts during a year over six months and even more with a view to eventually discontinuing the use of meat altogether.¹⁷⁵

Akbar abolished Janya early in his reign but Gujarat was not conquered at that time so the

(174) Hemavijaya Adhiksha Prasasti of A. D. 1593-4 vers 17 (175) Al-Badaoni—Translated by W. H. Lowe II p. 331.

tax was collected in Gujarāta even after the Mughal conquest. When Akbar came in contact with Hīravijayasūri, the latter persuaded him to abolish Jazīya.¹⁷⁶

If a person died childless, his property was confiscated by the state. The virtuous Kumārāpāla had, at the suggestion of Kalikālasarvagna Hemachandrasūri, given up this income. Jagad-guru Hīravijayasūri succeeded in persuading Akbar to give up this income and the property of a person who died childless was no longer confiscated by the state in Akbar's Empire.¹⁷⁷

Besides these victories, Hīravijayasūri and his pupils scored many more. Pilgrim tax collected from the pilgrims to the holy Śatrunjaya Hill was abolished, fishing in the Dābar lake at Fatehpur Sikrī was prohibited; prisoners of war were given their liberty, birds in cages were set free; and the possession of Śatrunjaya, Giranara, Talāja, Abu, Kesariājī, Parsvanatha Hill and other holy places of the Jains was given to the Jains.¹⁷⁸ In this way, Hīravijayasūri and his

(176) Hemavijaya, Adinatha prasasti of A. D. 1593-4, v 18 (177) Ibid, verse 18

(178) Ibid, verses 19-20, *Surisvara and Samrat*, p 123, *Jain Sahityano Itihas*, p p 550-1.

phipils used 'their influence at Court not only for the Jain community but also for humanity at large

Hiravijayasūri's sermons had good effect on (i) the king of Siróhi who repealed heavy taxes and prohibited the destruction of creatures throughout his state and (ii) Khan Mahamadkhan of Uná who became a vegetarian.¹⁷²

When Hiravijayasūri returned to Gujarata his pupils Santichandra, Vijayasena and Bhannuchandra continued to instruct Akbar in Jainism. The Jain monks "secured his (Akbar's) assent to their doctrines so far that he was reputed to have been converted to Jainism." Even Fr. Pinheiro a Portuguese believed that Akbar "follows the sect of the Jains (Vortel) Akbar however had not embraced Jainism, but had cultivated very great regard for its principles and had performed many pious and religious deeds at the suggestion of his Jain teachers"¹⁷³

In A. D. 1586-7 Hiravijayasūri left Agra for Gujarata. In A. D. 1593-4 he made a

(172 A) Ibid pp. 548-553.

(179) Vincent Smith Akbar p. 262; Sarisvara and Savrol p. 108.

pilgrimage to the holy Śatrunjaya Hill. In A. D 1596, he died ¹⁸⁰

Among the prominent pupils of Hiraṇyakaśyapa, we may mention Śāntichandra, Bhaṇuchandra and Vijayasenaśūri. Śāntichandra, the well-known author of the Kṛipārasakośa, was a great debater. In A. D 1576-7, he defeated Vādibhushana, a Digambara monk, in the Court of Nārāyaṇa of Idar. He won another victory over Digambara Gunachandra at Jodhpur.¹⁸¹

Bhaṇuchandra, another prominent pupil of Hiraṇyakaśyapa, persuaded Akbar to repeal the pilgrim tax on the Śatrunjaya Hill. Vijayasenaśūri who was honoured by Akbar had defeated Digambara Bhushana in a debate at Surat, pleased Khānkhanā, Suba of Ahmedabad, by his sermon, set up many Jain images and advised the Jains to repair the temples at many places of pilgrimage ¹⁸²

In the Hāirakayuga, Bhāmā Shah, an Oswal Jain, rendered glorious and meritorious services to Mewad by laying down his wealth at the feet

(180) *Jain Saṁvatsara Itihāsa*, pp 552-3, 548

(181) *Ibid*, p 553

(182) *Ibid*, p p 554-5

of Rana Pratapa and helping him to win his liberty Pratapa appreciated his services and made him his minister. Even to-day his descendants are honoured by the king of Udaipur.

We shall now consider the literary activities of the Jains in the Hakra-yuga.

Though books were written in Gujarati, Sanskrit and Prakrit still attracted the attention of the learned who have left us a good legacy in these languages.

In A. D. 1548-4 Virekakirtigani copied a commentary on the *Pingalastra* by Hariprasad. In A. D. 1548-9 Udayadharmagani wrote a commentary on the *Upadekavala*. In A. D. 1553-4 Ratnakara wrote a commentary on the *Jivachara* by Santisuri. In A. D. 1560-1 Jinachandrasuri composed the *Poshakavivahariti*, a commentary on the *Poshakavivahariti* by Jinavallabha. In A. D. 1552-3 Sadhukirti wrote a commentary on the *Sanghapattana*. In A. D. 1564-5 the *Vagbhata-lankaravivahariti* was composed.¹⁰

Dharmasagara pupil of Hiravijayasuri, composed the *Anshirukamatsutradipika* (A. D. 1560-1) *Tattvataranginivivahariti* *Pravachanaparibhasa*, *Irya-*

pathikashattrimsikā, *Kalpasutratikā* (1571-2 A. D)
Jambudwīpapragaptivṛtti (A. D 1582-3),
Gurvāvali-Pattāvali with a commentary, *Paryu-*
shanaśataka with commentary, *Sarvagnaśataka*,
Vardhamānadwatimsikā, and the *Shodashashloka-*
gurutattvapradīpadīpikā with commentary ¹⁸⁴

Vānararishi composed the *Gatohhāchārapayan-*
nātikā, *Bhavaprakarana* with commentary (A D.
 1567-8), *Bandhodayasattāprakarana*, *Tandula-*
Varyāli *yapayannā-avachuri*, *Pratīlekhanākulaka*
 and *avachuris* on Jinendrasūri's *Sādhāranajina-*
stava and Harshakulagani's *Bandhahetudaya-*
tribhanga ¹⁸⁵

Nayaranga composed the *Arjunamālākara*. In
 A D 1567-8, he composed the *Paramahansa-*
sambodhacharita. In A. D 1569-70 Dayaratna
 wrote the *Nyāyaratnāvali*. In the following
 year, Ajitadeva composed the *Pindavisuddhi*
Dīpikā. In A D 1571-2, he wrote the *Uttara-*
dhyayanāsutratika. The *Āchārāngatika* is the
 other known work ¹⁸⁶

184 Buhler, VIII, No 384, Bhandarakara, III, pp
 144-155, Kielhorn, II, No 368 (published); Velankara,
 Nos 1459 and 1847, Buhler, VIII, No 399

185 *Jain Sāhityano Itihāsa*, p 584

186 *Ibid*, p p. 584-5

Chandrakirtisūri was the author of the *Chandraseatikā* (about A. D. 1578-4) and a commentary on the *Sārasvata Vyākaranam*.¹⁸⁷

Sakaleshandragani composed the *Dhyanodipikā* *Dharmasūtrā* and the *Sraddhāśāstra* (A. D. 1578-4).¹⁸⁸

Hemavijaya, pupil of Kamalavijaya of Tapogachha composed the *Pūrvanāthacharita* (A. D. 1575-6) *Rishabhacharita* (A. D. 1599-1600), *Kathāratnāvara* (about A. D. 1600), *Ayaktimuktamahodadhi* *Kirtikallolini* *Suktaratnavali* *Sadbhāvatatā* *Chaturvimsatistuti* *Sūtrādakātarangini* *Vijayastuti* and the *Vijayoprasasti*.¹⁸⁹

Padmasagara composed the *Nayaprakāśa* *āśtaka* *Silaprakāśa* (A. D. 1577-8) *Dharmaparikāśa* (A. D. 1588-9), *Jagadgurukāvya* (A. D. 1589-90) *Uttarādhyayanakathāsaṅgraha* *Yukti-prakāśa* *Prasādanaprakāśa*, *Tilakamanyaravriti* and the *Yatodharacharita*.¹⁹⁰

Ravisagara was the author of the *Rupasacharita*, *Pradyumnacharita* (A. D. 1588-9) and the *Ekādasīkathā* (A. D. 1588-9).¹⁹¹

187 Ibid p. 585, 188 Ibid p. 585

189 Ibid pp. 585-6, 190 Peterson IV 102; Yasovijaya granthamālā Publication No. 14; Velankara No. 1703 191-92 Desai Loc. cit., pp. 586-7; 191-92, Bühler II, No. 226.

Punyasāgara, pupil of Jinahansasuri, composed the *Prasnottarakāvya-vṛtti* (A. D 1583-4) and the *Jambudvīpapragnapti-vṛtti* (A. D 1588-9)¹⁹³

Kshemarāja of Kharatara gatchha had a pupil named Jayasoma who composed the *Iryāvahikā-trimsikā* (A. D 1583-4) and the *Poshadha-prakarana* with commentary¹⁹⁴

Samayasundara, pupil of Sakalachandra, was a great writer In A. D. 1545-6, he composed the *Bhavasataka*. In A. D. 1589-90, he commenced the *Ashtalakshī* and completed the same after 30 years Most of his works were composed in the first half of the 17th Century and are, therefore, not mentioned here¹⁹⁵

Gunavinaya Upādhyāya, pupil of Jayasoma of Kharataragatchha composed the *Khandaprasasti-vṛtti* (A. D 1585-6), *Raghuvamsatikā* (A. D 1589-90), *Varagyasatakatika* (A. D 1590-1), *Ajitasāntitika*, *Matabhāshinivṛtti* and the *Laghusantivṛtti*¹⁹⁶

Sāntichandra, pupil of Sakalachandra of Tapagatchha, was the author of the *Kripārasakosa*,

193 Desai, Loc Cit, p 587 194 Ibid, pp. 587-8 195 Peterson, I, 68 196 Velankar, Nos 1182, 1214, Desai, Loc Cit., pp. 589-90

the *Jambudvīpapragnapti vṛtti* and *Aṣṭavarṣa-stava* (A. D. 1594-5) The *Kṛiparasāsa* is a short work containing 128 verses and praises the good qualities of Emperor Akbar.¹⁹⁷

Kanakakusala pupil of Vijayasenāsuri, was the author of the *Pinastuti* (A. D. 1584-5) *Kalyāṇamandirastōtratikā* *Vīṇālochanavṛtī* (1596-7 A. D.) *Saubhāgyapāṇchamkathā* (A. D. 1598-9), *Sadharanayānasāvāsa āvachara*, *Ratnā-karāpāṇchavimsatikā* *Surapriyāmanikā* (A. D. 1599-1600) and the *Rāṇasaya Kathānaka*.¹⁹⁸

Harshakṛtsuri pupil of Chandraśekhara composed the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* (A. D. 1598-9) *Sinduraprakāśanatikā* *Sārasvatādīpikā* *Dhātupāṭha-taranginī* *Sāradāyanamāṇḍalā* *Srutabodhanṛtī*, *Yogaśāntāraṇi* and the *Vandakāṣṭhādīkā*.¹⁹⁹

Gujarati Literature also received great encouragement in the Harakayuga. The prominent prose writers are Kusulabhuvanagani author of the *Saptatikā* (A. D. 1544-5) Somavimalasuri author of the *Kalparātra* the *Dāśarajāhīkārātra*

197 Weber No. 1447; Peterson I. 72.

198. Velankar N. 1800 Gulabkumārī Library Calcutta, Manuscript No. 493; Peterson I. 210 199. Velankar N. 1801), Gulabkumārī Library Calcutta Manuscript Nos. 49-53 and 37; Weber No. 1703.

and the *Samstāraprakīrnaka payannā*, Nagarshi-gani, author of the *Sangrahaṇi*, and Kanakakusala, author of *Varadatta Gunamanjari Katha* (A D 1598-9), *Saubhāgyapanchamīkathā* and the *Gnānapanchamīkathā*.²⁰¹

Many Gujarātī Jain poets flourished in this Yuga. In a small book like this, it is not possible to go into the details of their works²⁰².

We shall now consider contribution of the Jains to the history of Gujarāt. They have given to us statesmen and administrators like Munjala, Santu, Udayana, Vagbhata, Āmrabhata, Sajjana, Yasahpala, Vastupāla, Tejahpala etc; learned men like Hemachandrasūri, Abhayadeva Maladhari, Paramānanda, Tilakaśhārya, Jinapala, Padmaprabha, etc. For the history of the Chavada and Solanki kings of Anahilavada, we are entirely indebted to the Jain chroniclers. The Jains have, moreover, adorned the hills and mountains of Gujarāt with beautiful temples and given us the Delwara temples which are the triumphs of art

201 Desai, *Jain Sahityano Itihās*, pp 603-4. The detailed information about the poets and their works will be found in the *Jain Gurjar Kavo*, Part I, pp 131-320. Nayasundara, Jayavanta, Kusalaśhārya, Ratnasundara, Sakalachandra and Bhima were the well-known poets of the Harakayuga.

But their greatest contribution is the doctrine of non-violence. With the counsel and consent "and advice and assent" of Hemachandraraj Kumarapala proclaimed amara. This had a salutary effect. People came to believe that not only service of mankind is service of God but service of all living creatures great or small is service of God. Instinct (or impulse drive propensities etc.) of self-preservation, say the modern psychologists is the strongest in all living creatures from amoeba to man and Jainism taught people to respect that impulse in all creatures. The effects of the work of Hemachandraraj and Kumarapala are clearly seen in Gujarat even to-day. Whereas in some parts of India even the Brahmins take non-vegetarian diet, in Gujarat not only the Brahmins but all the high caste Hindus refrain from making their stomachs the graves of animals. In this century Mahatma Gandhi applied this doctrine of non-violence to politics and won freedom for India —

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

CHAPTERS I and II.

Hemachandrasūri	<i>Dvyāśrayamahākāvya</i>
"	<i>Kumārapālachariyam</i>
"	<i>Prasasti to the Siddha-Hema</i>
"	<i>Mahāvira-charita</i>
Somaprabhacharya	<i>Kumārapālapratiṭodha</i>
Yāśahpāla	<i>Mohaparājaya</i>
Prabhachandrasūri	<i>Prabhāvakacharita</i>
Merutungasūri	<i>Prabandhachintāmaṇi</i>
Rajasekharasūri	<i>Chaturvimsatiprabandha</i>
Jinamandanagani	<i>Kumārapālprabandha</i>
Parikh R. C.	<i>Kāvyaṇusāsana</i>

CHAPTERS III and IV.

Someśvara	<i>Kirtikaumudī</i>
"	<i>Surathotsava</i>
"	<i>Ullāsarāghava</i>
"	<i>Gīranāraprasasti</i>
Arasimha	<i>Sukritasankirtana</i>
Jayasimhasūri	<i>Hamiramadamardana</i>
Udayaprabhasūri	<i>Dharmābhyudayamahākāvya</i>
Merutungasūri	<i>Prabandhachintāmaṇi</i>

Rajasekhara
Balachandra

Chaturvimsatiprabandha
Vasantavilasa

CHAPTERS V and VI

Munisundara
Chāṇṭraratnagani
Somacharitra

Guroṇāṭh
Chitrakūṭadurgamahāvira-
prāśadaprasasti
Gurugunaratnākara

CHAPTERS VII and VIII

Desai M. D
Padmasagara
Dharmasagara
Devavimala
Santichandra

Jam Sahityano Itihasa
Jam Gurjor Kavio
Jagadgurukāvya
Tapōgatāhārapittācali
Hirasambhagyaamahākāvya
Kripārasakosa



territory. He pushed on his boundaries to within a short distance of Ahmadnagar. Shāh Jahān tried to gain support from Malik Ambar but the astute diplomat would not help a forlorn fugitive and thus bring down on himself the wrath of the Mughal Emperor especially at a time when he was meditating war against Bijāpur. Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh also refused to grant any assistance to the rebel prince.¹⁰² Shāh Jahān's revolt left Malik Ambar the master of the situation and he no longer pretended friendship with his neighbours of Bijāpur and Golconda. Till now the Deccan kingdoms knew the value of unity. Malik Ambar himself made humble requests to Bijāpur to help him and Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh seeing the necessity of preserving Ahmadnagar between Bijāpur and the Mughal Empire readily granted that help. But Malik Ambar assumed an insolent attitude towards Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh, after his latest success over the Mughals.¹⁰³ In addition to this there came into existence at the Bijāpur court a school of thought viewing that Ibrāhīm had helped Ambar to become too powerful and that, therefore he should now join the Mughals and thus adjust the balance of power.¹⁰⁴ There was also the fact that one of Ibrāhīm's wives was said to be in conspiracy with Malik Ambar to depose the sultān and place her son Darvish on the throne.¹⁰⁵ Lastly there was the aggressive attitude of Malik Ambar who marching into Bijāpur territory openly showed his hostility.¹⁰⁶ All these factors resulted in Ibrāhīm's making an offer of alliance to the Mughals. Prince Parvīz who had been appointed to the viceroyalty of the Deccan had already sent envoys to Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh offering him Mughal friendship.¹⁰⁷ He made a recommendation to the Emperor that between Ahmadnagar and Bijāpur the choice for an imperial alliance should fall on the latter.

Malik Ambar also at the same time was straining every nerve to gain the friendship of the Mughals. He offered

102. *Res. Prasad* 349-70.

104. *Cf.* S. B. 62.

106. *Cf.* *Iqbalnāma* 221.

103. *F. A. J. S. h.*

105. *P. D. V.* 411.

107. *F. A. J. S. h.*

personally to wait upon Mahābat Khan, the Mughal general in the Deccan, and also agreed to send his son in the imperial service, with a promise of ever-lasting fidelity and devotion. There was thus a race between Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh and Malīk 'Ambar to be the first to form an alliance with the Mughals. Malīk 'Ambar sent his envoy 'Alī Sher to Mahābat Khan, professing obedience to the Emperor and requesting Mughal help in the war against Bijāpur in which he was then engaged. But mainly due to the good offices of prince Parvīz Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh's cause prevailed. Mahābat Khān, the imperial commander-in-chief, rejected the proposals of Malīk 'Ambar, and decided in favour of Bijāpur.¹⁰⁸ The reason why the Mughals allied themselves with the Bijāpuris was possibly to wedge the Ahmadnagar territory between Mughal Deccan and Bijāpur. Malīk 'Ambar, with the help of his Marāthā 'bargīrs'¹⁰⁹ had proved too troublesome to the Mughals. It was, therefore, natural that they should first want to remove this thorn in their side.

After the alliance was concluded, Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh, true to his offer, sent Mullā Muhammad Lārī at the head of 5,000 cavalry to join the imperial troops.¹¹⁰ Alarmed at this active alliance, Malīk 'Ambar left Kharkī, sent his family to Daulatābād and proceeded to the Golconda frontier, ostensibly to recover some payments,¹¹¹ but really to conclude a counter alliance with Golconda.

Malīk 'Ambar arrived at an understanding with Muhammad Qutb Shāh by which the latter agreed to maintain his neutrality in the present struggle. This done Malīk suddenly marched towards Bīdar, made a surprise attack on the city and plundered it. He even advanced towards the 'Ādilshāhī capital itself. Most of the 'Ādilshāhī cavalry was

108 Iqbalnāma, 223, Tuzuk II 296

109 At first the Maratha mercenaries recruited in the Nizāmshāhī Army were known by this name, but later on it became in popular speech the designation of a Maratha trooper. Grant Duff I 61

110 Tuzuk II 296 Iqbalnāma, 224

111 Iqbalnāma, 223-24

at this time with the Mughals at Burhanpur. So Ibrahim Adil Shih did not engage Malik Ambar in an encounter but shut himself up in the capital and sent word to the Mughal camp at Burhanpur for his relief. Undaunted Malik Ambar laid siege to Bijapur.¹¹²

Muhammad Lari pressed the Imperial officers to allow him to depart. Mahabat Khan seeing that the situation was serious allowed him to start for Bijapur and also sent with him Lashkar Khan a Mughal officer with some Imperial troops to oppose Malik Ambar. Malik Ambar once again tried to isolate the Adilshahis. And to this end he wrote to Mahabat Khan. He said the quarrel between Ibrahim Adil Shih and himself was not of such consequence that the Imperialists should interfere. As an additional inducement to the Mughals to withdraw their support from Bijapur he made further assertions of his loyalty to the Emperor.¹¹³ But his entreaties were not heeded, he was therefore forced to take some decided course. He raised the siege of Bijapur and marched northwards. He succeeded so well in keeping his movements secret, that his enemy had no exact knowledge of his whereabouts. So, one day he suddenly appeared on the edge of the Imperial and Adilshahi camp at a place called Bhitor about eight miles from Ahmadnagar. A battle was fought and the combined army defeated (Nov. 1624). Mulla Muhammad Lari, the Adilshahi general lost his life. Thus ended the battle of Bhitor.

After the battle of Bhitor Malik Ambar with his victorious army marched through Bijapur territory unhindered till he came within reach of the capital itself on the outskirts of which was Ibrahim's favourite resort Naorapur. This Malik Ambar stormed.

He next laid siege to Sholapur which had long

112. Iqbalnama 234-35 F. A. 285a.

113. Iqbalnama 235-36.

114. Iqbalnama 236-37; F. A. 285a-285b; B. A. 274; Jadid

been a bone of contention between the 'two kingdoms, and having brought guns from Daulatābād, stormed the town which soon surrendered.¹¹⁵ But, during Malik 'Ambar's most successful moments one of his powerful nobles left him. At this time Shahājī came over to Bijāpur nursing a grudge against 'Ambar for not having recognised his services during the struggle against the enemies. He was welcomed at the Bijāpur court and given a 'mansab'.¹¹⁶ Another person at Bijāpur who wanted to take revenge on Ambar was Muhammad Amīn, the son-in-law of Mullā Muhammad Lārī. But, before the two could induce Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh to take up arms once more against their common enemy, Malik 'Ambar died on May 14, 1626.¹¹⁷

The Scene Changes — Thus the political affairs of the Deccan during the first quarter of the seventeenth century culminated in the battle of Bhātūrī. It was a great triumph for Malik 'Ambar. The Mughals were beaten back. 'Ādil Shāh was awed and Malik 'Ambar seemed fairly on his way to reinstate the past glory of the Nizāmshāhī kingdom. But soon after his decisive victory, he died. He was held in great respect by the Deccan kings and was the only person who could form a confederacy in the Deccan against the Mughals, who were never able to gain a firm foot-hold in that country as long as he lived. He went near to recreating the Nizāmshāhī kingdom, which, had he lived a few years longer, could have been able to bear the brunt of the Mughal arms, to form an effective barrier between Delhi and Bijāpur. How far the Deccan might have been united is, however, a matter for historical speculation. With Malik 'Ambar's death, the last capable defender of Ahmadnagar, we may even say of the Deccan, passed away, after him, no one could succeed in emphasising the fact that unity alone could enable the Deccan

115 Iqbalnāma 237-38, B S 274, F A 292a, Jedhe

116 S B V 112, Shahājī, 62

117 Jedhe. It appears from Shīvabhārat that the military preparations made against Malik 'Ambar were utilised by Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh by sending Shahājī on a campaign against Carnātak and the Keral territory and to subdue the Marātha Sardār Mudhojī of Phaltan. S B V 17 19

sultanates to repel the common enemy. Alike as a soldier, a general, diplomat and an administrator, Malik Ambar was unrivalled in greatness. He controlled the unruly spirits of the Deccan and to the end of his life maintained his position and governed with ability. History has no parallel of a man of so humble antecedents rising to such eminence.¹¹⁸

Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh did not survive Malik Ambar long; he died on September 12, 1627.¹¹⁹ Ibrāhīm was a man of learning and taste and well-versed in poetry. Music had great fascination for him, and following the traditional custom of musicians, he too became a devotee of the goddess Sarasvatī, though in religious matters he had Sunni inclinations. He was not a bigoted Sunni but like Akbar liberal in his religious views and was known as the Jagadguru.¹²⁰

Though during the early years of his reign the kingdom was fraught with internal discord, most of the last years of his rule were spent in peace, the theatre of war being always on the borderline between the Moghals and Malik Ambar. He extended the boundaries of his dominions and at the time of his death left a large treasury and a strong army. Altogether he was one of the best of the Ādilshāhī kings and his memory is still preserved with respect in the country where he ruled.

118. *Iqbalnama*, 271-72.

119. B. R. 282; *Great Durrā* I, 73; *Comment* 78.

120. B. R. 279.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1 'Abdul Qādīr Badāunī · Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh
3 vols Bibliotheca Indica
- 2 Abu'l Fazl Akbarnāma 3 vols. Translated by
H Beveridge Bibliotheca Indica
- 3 'Alī bin Azīzullāh Tabātabāī · Burhān-i-Maāsir.
Translated by Major J S King (Bahmanī dynasty)
and Sir Wolsley Haig (Nizāmshāhī dynasty) in the
Indian Antiquary Vols 49-52
- 4 Asad Beg Wāqī 'a-i-Asad Beg Full Translation
B M Add 30, 776, folios 33-84 (unpublished)
- 5 Beni Prasad . History of the Reign of Jahangir.
- 6 Ferishta, Muhammad Qāsīm bin Hindū Shāh · Tārīkh-
i-Ferishta Edited by Mīr Khairat 'Alī Khān and
J Briggs 2 Vols Lithographed Bombay, 1831
- 7 Fīzūnī Astrābādī 'Futūhāt-i-'Ādilshāhī B M Add
27, 251 (unpublished)
- 8 Grant Duff, J History of the Marathas Edited by
S M Edwardes Vol I
- 9 Heras, Fr H. The Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagar.
- 10 Jahāngīr Tuzuk-i-Jahāngīrī Memoirs of Emperor
Jahāngīr Translated by Rogers, A and Beveridge,
H 2 Vols Oriental Translation Fund
- 11 Jedhe Chronology Proceedings of the Fourth Annual
Conference of the Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal,
Poona 1917
- 12 Mirzā Ibrāhīm Zubairī Busātīn-us-Salātīn Litho-
graphed Hyderabad
- 13 Mu'tamad Khān Iqbāl-nāma-i-Jahāngīrī Bibliotheca
Indica
- 14 Rafī-ud-dīn Shīrāzī · Tazkīrat-ul-Mulūk B M Add.
23, 83 (unpublished)

THE PROBLEM OF THE INTRODUCTION OF RĀSIS IN INDIAN ASTRONOMY AND ASTROLOGY

BY MAHARAHOPADHYAYA P. V. KANE

The problem of the introduction of the twelve Zodiacal Signs in Indian astronomy and astrology has not been yet satisfactorily solved. Western scholars are generally inclined to hold that astrology based on Rāsis was borrowed from the Greeks in the 3rd or 4th century A. D.¹ In this connection three important questions arise: firstly whether the system of rāsis was developed in India as an indigenous theory or was it borrowed from a foreign source; secondly when was the system whether indigenous or borrowed introduced; and thirdly if it was borrowed from whom it was borrowed and when.

Recently when there was a movement to celebrate the lapse of 2000 years of the Vikrama era I suggested to certain scholars that one of the important questions that should be tackled in connection with the books planned should relate to the introduction of rāsis in India. I gave several reasons for my request. That question has an important bearing on the very existence of a king Vikramāditya in about 57 B. C. and on the chronology of many literary works in Sanskrit. A famous verse states that nine gems adorned the court of Vikrama, among whom were the famous poet Kālidāsa, Amarasimha the author of a lexicon, Varāhamihira and Vararuci. Varāhamihira in his *Pañcatantrasamuccaya* takes the Śaka year 427 (505-6 A. D.) for his starting point. So he must have flourished about that time. Varāhamihira bases his astrology on the rāsi system and quotes many predecessors. So it is clear that the rāsi

1. Vide Jacobi in *ZDMG* 38 p. 302 & pp. 306 ff. Dr. Jolly in *Recht und Stil* (p. 43 of Dr. Batakrisna Ghosh's English translation), *Weber History of Indian Literature* p. 229.

system could not in any event be regarded as introduced later than the 3rd or 4th century A D There are many scholars who hold that Kālidāsa flourished under Candragupta II (of the Gupta dynasty) who was styled Vikramāditya and who reigned from about 375 A D to 413 A D or under Skandagupta (455 to 480 A D) If these views be accepted and if it be held that at least Kālidāsa graced the court of Vikramāditya then the existence of a Vikramāditya in 57 B C at whose court Kālidāsa flourished becomes almost impossible Kālidāsa shows acquaintance with astrology based on rāsis He states that Raghu was born when five planets were *ucca* (in exaltation) and not too near the sun, which was an indication of the greatness of his fortune (*Raghuvaṃśa*, III 13) In the drama *Mālavikāgnimitra* III (at end) Kālidāsa speaks of Mars approaching a rāśi after being retrograde (Angarako rāśimiva) In order that Kālidāsa who knew rāśi astrology should flourish at the court of Vikramāditya in 57 B C it must be established by evidence that rāśi astrology was well-known in India in the 2nd century B C at the latest I regret to find that in the papers published in Marathi in connection with the 2000th anniversary of Vikrama's era this question has not been dealt with by anybody in a thorough-going manner I shall feel extremely glad if a competent scholar examines Babylonian, Assyrian or Egyptian evidence and also the evidence afforded by Sanskrit Literature, goes into this question thoroughly and arrives at definite conclusions on satisfactory evidence. In the forthcoming 4th volume of my *History of Dharmaśāstra* I have to deal with the topic of *Muhūrta* and I am myself engaged in collecting evidence on this subject In this brief paper I shall point out only some of the lines on which one will have to proceed in arriving at satisfactory conclusions in this matter

It is to be noted that in ancient India a sort of astrology of based upon the *nakṣatras* only prevailed The Rgveda in describing the marriage of Sūryā states that the marriage dowry consisting of cows, was driven on the Aghās (Maghā nakṣatra) and that she was married on the Arjunīs (Pūrvā Falgunī) The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* says that a daughter

should be given in marriage on the Nistya (Svāti nakṣatra) if the father desires that she should be her husband's favourite wife (I 5 2 3). The same Brāhmaṇa says that ploughing was to be begun on Maitra (i.e. Anurādhā) nakṣatra. The sūtra literature also prescribes that several things should be done on certain nakṣatras. For example the *Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra* says (II 1 9-10) that *Āgnyādānya* (the consecration of Vedic fires) should be done when the moon is in the Kṛttikā, Rohiṇī Mṛgaśīras the Falguṇā (Pūrva and Uttara), Viśākhā and on the Uttara Bhādrapada.² The *Āśvalāyana-gṛhya* says (I 4 1) that tonsure (*caśa*), upanayana *goddas* (or Keśānta) and marriage should be performed in the time of the north-ward path of the Sun in the bright half (of a month) and on an auspicious nakṣatra. All the sūtras are silent about *Rāśis*. Manu and Yājñavalkya in their extensive smṛtis have not even once referred to *rāśis*. In the *Vaidhāna-smṛti-sūtra* (edited by Dr. Caland 1927) which knows week days and nine *grahas* *rāśis* are not mentioned though certain astrological matters based on nakṣatras are noted (IV 14) viz. the constellation on which a man is born *haras* Śāṅghātika Śālmudāyika and Vaināśika are noted. The *Viṣṇudharinottara Purāṇa* (II 166) contains a brief summary of a very extensive mythical work on astronomy and astrology in which these terms are explained. It is stated there that the nakṣatra on which a man is born as also the 10th and 19th nakṣatras from the actual nakṣatra of birth are called *Janma-nakṣatras* the second nakṣatra from all these three causes prosperity (i.e. the 2nd 11th and 20th) the third from the same three causes adversity the 4th from the same is *Aparya* (causing happiness) the 5th is called *pratyari* (onemical), the sixth *śādhaka*

2. अमन्वाचवम् । कृत्तिकासु रोहिण्यां मृगशिरसि फल्गुनीषु निराकरो
रत्तराशौ मीढपराशौ । आय धौ II 1 9-10; compare आय धौ V 32B.

3. उपसन्न आर्षमाणपथे कस्यापि वस्त्रे वीरकमोपलवनमोशनविशदम् ।
आय धौ I 41 compare आय धौ I 12 and Jalabhi Pūrvaṇṇabhaṭṭ
I 8.23

4. अमन्वाचवम् । कृत्तिकासु रोहिण्यां मृगशिरसि फल्गुनीषु निराकरो
रत्तराशौ मीढपराशौ । आय धौ II 1 9-10; compare आय धौ V 32B.

(helper), the 7th is *naidhana* (death-dealing), the 8th is *maitra* (friendly) and the 9th is called very friendly (parama-mitra) and that all auspicious rites and actions should be performed on the 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th and 9th

Kautilya appears to be unaware of rāśis, though he condemns too much reliance on nakṣatra astrology⁵. The *Yogayātrā* (IX 1-2) of Varāhamihira explains the above terms somewhat differently viz 'the nakṣatra of birth is called ādya (the first), the 10th nakṣatra from it is called *Karma*, the 16th from the first is called *sāṅghātika*, the 18th is styled *samudāya*, the 23rd is styled *Vaināsika* and the 25th is called *mānasa*. Ordinary men are concerned only with six nakṣatras, while the king is concerned with three additional ones viz *jāti* (caste?), *deśa* (the nakṣatra governing his country) and *abhiseka* (the nakṣatra on which his coronation took place)⁶.

The *Mahābhārata* is silent about rāśis and mentions astronomical phenomena in relation to nakṣatras alone (e.g. vide Adī 71 34, 221 85, Vanaparva 230 8-11, 277 15, 281 6, 291 66, Bhīṣma 3 27-33, Anuśāsana 64 &c). There is one doubtful verse. In the Vanaparva (Bombay edition) 190 90-91 it is stated 'when the Sun, the Moon, Jupiter and Tisya (Puṣya) will come together on the same rāśi, then Kṛta age will begin'. In the first place, it has to be remembered that this verse does not occur in many Mss, secondly that it occurs with slight variation in several Purāṇas (e.g. *Bhāgavata* XII-

⁵ नक्षत्रमतिप्रच्युतन्त वालमर्थोतिवर्तते । अथो ह्यर्थस्य नक्षत्र किं करिष्यन्ति तारका ॥ अर्थशास्त्र ix. 4 (last verse but one).

⁶ जन्मक्षमाद्य दशम तु कर्म साङ्गातिकं षोडशमृक्षमाद्यात् । अष्टादश स्यात्समुदायसञ्ज्ञं वैनाशिकं विंशतितस्तृतीयम् ॥ यत्पञ्चविंश खलु मानसं तत् षट्षष्ट एव पुरुषस्तु सर्वम् । राजो नवक्षणाणि वदन्ति जातिदेशामिषेवैः सहितानि तानि ॥ योगयात्रा ix 1-2 led by Jagadish Lal, Lahore 1944)

Similar verses occur in the *Bṛhadhōgayaṭra* of Varāhamihira iv, 14-15 (from a ms) in the Bhau Daji collection at the Bombay Asiatic Society's Library.

⁷ यदा सूर्यश्च चन्द्रश्च तथा तिष्यबृहस्पती ।

एकराशौ समेष्यन्ति प्रपत्स्यति तदा कृतम् ॥ वनपर्व 190-91

2.24 *Vāyu* 99.413) thirdly that the *Vāyupurāṇa* reads *eka. rātre* for *ekarātau* the former being a better reading. It appears therefore that this verse is a later addition probably from the *Vāyupurāṇa*, since in *Vanaparva* 191.16 the *Purāṇa* declared by *Vāyu* is expressly mentioned. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Ayodhyā 15.3) *Karkātaka lagna* is mentioned (in the Madras Law Journal Press edition), but it is wanting in Gorresio's text. Therefore these two verses from the Epics cannot be relied upon for proving the ancient age of the theory of *rāśis*.

Inscriptions do not enable us to carry the occurrence of *rāśis* to a period earlier than the 5th century A. D. In Dr R. C. Majumdar's volume on *Champā* there is an inscription (at end No. 7 pp. 10-11) which must be dated between 478 to 578 A. D. (as it expressly states that when 400 years of the Śaka era had elapsed) and in which the words *lagna hora drekkṣṣa, navāśas trithāśas* occur showing thereby that the full fledged astrology based on *rāśis* had been carried to the Far East in *Champā* before the 6th century A. D. It appears that on certain stone railings at *Buddha-Gayā* belonging to about the first century B. C. the several *rāśis* are represented symbolically though not in the same sequence as in *Varāhamihira's* works (vide Dr Barua's *Gayā and Buddha-Gayā* vol. II pp. 90-93 and plates 43 a to l).

We know from the 13th rock Edict that before 256 B. C. the great Emperor *Aśoka* had sent missionaries to five kings of the West viz. to *Antiochos* (*Antiyoga Yonaraja* of the inscription), *Ptolemy* (*Turamīya* or *Tulamsya*), *Magas Antigonos* (*Antekina*) and *Alexander* (*Alikasudara*) who ruled respectively over *Syria*, *Egypt*, *Cyrene*, *Macedonia* and *Ephrus*. So if *rāśis* were borrowed by India at all they could have done so in the 3rd century B. C. from *Syria* or *Egypt*.

Sir Norman Lockyer in *Dawn of Astronomy* notes (p. 407) that almost all the twelve signs of the Zodiac were established in *Babylonia* about 1000 B. C. Sir E. A. Wallis Budge in his work *Babylonian Life and History* (p. 211) says that the early *Babylonian* astronomers were well

acquainted with the twelve signs of the Zodiac and the 36 *Dekans*. This last word seems to be the same as the word *Drkkāna* or *Drekkāna* employed in the astrological works of *Varāhamihira* and others (for $\frac{1}{2}$ of a *rāśi*) *Jastrow* in 'Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria' (1915) p. 262 remarks that the Greeks took over the astrological system perfected in the Euphrates valley and grafted it on to their own astronomy. *Sir F. Petrie* in 'Religious Life in Ancient Egypt' remarks (on p. 204), 'Herodotus says that each month and day belonged to a special God and by the day of birth the fate of the person is determined. The development of horoscopes seems to have been mainly in the XIX dynasty. They are figured on the temples of *Ramessu II* and the tomb of *Ramessu VI*'.

Varāhamihira in his *Bṛhatsamhitā* II 14 notes that the *Yavanas* are *Mlechhas*, that astrology has been well-cultivated among them and that they are honoured like *ṛsis*. He mentions a writer called *Yavaneśvara* and *Utpala* in his commentaries quotes at least two hundred verses (mostly in the *Upajāti* or *Indravajrā* metre) from *Yavaneśvara*. It is not unlikely that *Yavaneśvara* was a Greek who was a bilingualist and wrote his work in the first centuries of the Christian era. The *Besnagar* column Inscription of the *Bhāgvata Heliodora*, son of *Diya*, and many other records show that many Greeks had become Indianized in the 2nd or 1st century B. C. (Vide *W. W. Tarn's 'Greeks in Bactria and India'* p. 390). *Varāhamihira* cites non-Sanskrit names for the twelve signs (*Bṛhajjātaka* I 8 'Kriyatāvurī &c'), for the twelve houses (I 15-18, such as *kaṇṭaka*, *kendra*, *Panaphara*, *Āpoklima*, *Jāmitra* &c), and for the planets (II 2-3, *Holi* for the Sun, *Āra* for Mars, *Kona* for Saturn, *Jīva* for Jupiter, *Āsphujit* for Venus &c). These and other non-Sanskrit terms have to be carefully studied with reference to Babylonian, Egyptian and Greek astrological terms and theories. What a close study of these will lead to may be reserved for treatment in another place.

THE LEGEND OF THE APTYA - DEVATAS - TRITA DVITA & EKATA

By Dr H R Karnik

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (SBR) I 2-3 opens with the legend of the origin of the Aptya Devatās to whom the water used for cleansing is to be offered ceremonially thus assigning a symbolical reason for this offering :

Formerly Agni had a four fold form. That Agni whom the Gods chose for the office of the Hotṛ priest passed away. The second and third forms of Agni suffered from the same fate. The fourth form however lay concealed in the waters for fear of meeting with the same fate as his predecessors did. The Gods knew that he had concealed himself in the waters and dragged him out per force. This Agni thereupon spat on the waters because the latter had not offered him any protection. The Gods took this Agni much against his will. The *nipkṛāṇa* served as the *Pīṣa* or the germinal fluid and from that were produced the deities Trita, Dvita and Ekata. As they were produced from the waters they were called Aptya.

They wandered with Indra as the priest wanders with the king.¹ When Indra was about to kill the three-headed Vīśva-rūpa, the son of Tvāṣṭr the Aptyaas being his associates knew of this intention of their leader. The Tvāṣṭra Vīśvarūpa was the sister's son of the Asuras but served as Purohita of the Gods. Indra killed him because he secretly contrived to let the oblations go to the Asuras instead of to the Gods. But

1. The first paper on this topic was published in the *Journal of the University of Bombay* September 1947.

2. "Yathā idam brāhmaṇaṇaḥ rāṣṭram avastarati. This probably refers to the then usual custom of the priest lavishly accompanying his royal patron even in the latter's expeditions. The priest, on these occasions offered prayers to the deities for the victory of his patron.

by killing this Tvāstra Viśva-rūpa Indra was guilty of the most hideous crime of *Brahma-hatyā*. He was, however, acquitted of the guilt as he was a God. The sin of *Brahma-hatyā* was transferred to the Āptyas because they were the abettors in the crime.³ But how was that sin to be transferred? The priests hit upon the plan of the 'sacrifice'. The sacrificer transfers any guilt or sin incurred during the preparation of the rice-cake to the Āptyas when the water used for cleansing the dish and the fingers is poured out for them as an offering.

"But the Āptyas were not ready to receive the guilt themselves, why should they? The *brahma-hatyā* was committed by Indra. They simply knew of Indra's intention of killing the Tvāstra since they were his companions. They were not instrumental in actually killing the demon-priest. Why should they, then, be charged with the sin of *brahma-hatyā*? Why should it be transferred to them? They could not, however, revolt against what was being done at the instance or with the knowledge of Indra, their leader and the lord of the Gods. They, therefore, condescended to the transfer of the guilt to themselves but were not prepared to bear it at all. They, in their turn, hit upon a device for transferring the guilt so transferred to them to one who would make an offering without a gift to the priest, i.e. the usual *dakṣiṇā*. One should not, therefore, make an offering without the *dakṣiṇā* to the officiating priest for otherwise the sin of *brahma-hatyā* would be transferred to him."⁴

The legend is a symbolical narrative for the following reasons. It explains the origin of the Āptyas—Trita, Dvita and Ekata from the *niṣṭhivana* of Agni whom the waters did not protect from the Gods. The legend offers no explanation for the fright or fear of Agni. The fourth form of Agni concealed himself from the Gods as he was not prepared to officiate as the Hotr—priest of the Gods. In evading this office he had the fate of his predecessors in mind. He

3 "Upavema eno gacchatu yesya vadhasyāvedīṣuḥ".

4 "Tasmān na adakṣiṇena haviṣā yajeta āptya u ha tasmān mṛgate yat adakṣiṇena haviṣā yajate".

probably felt that their fate was due to their being chosen as Hotṛ - priest by the Gods. He evidently did not wish that the same fate should overtake him. He therefore concealed himself in the immediately available hiding place viz the waters and expected that the waters would not betray him to the Gods. The Gods however were determined to have Agni at least in its fourth and last form as their hotṛ priest. They found him concealed in the waters, dragged him out and made him accept the priestly office. This naturally enraged Agni. He could not however ventilate his anger on the Gods as they were too powerful for him. Having been convinced that his present fate which was unwholesome from his point of view was due to his being betrayed by the waters he was wild with them. Nobody could find fault with Agni in this respect. To escape from the Gods Agni concealed himself in the waters whom he thought to be the safest place of refuge. He least expected that this safest place of refuge would open its portals to the Gods and thus betray him to them. When the least expected became a reality and when Agni found himself in a situation which he had tried to avoid until then, he lost all control over himself and spat on the treacherous waters, thus expressing his utter disregard for them and his complete disapproval of their perfidious conduct. In this Agni has shown a perfectly natural trait. How many of us would control ourselves if placed in the situation as Agni! We have to absolve Agni of weakness of mind. It was not a weakness but a natural re-action to the treachery of the waters. Such a faithless conduct could go hardly unpunished in the domain of worldly or practical wisdom.

But, out of evil cometh good. The treachery of the Gods proved to be the cause of the origin of the Āptyas. Agni spat on the faithless waters. It was the *nipkṛṣṇa* of Agni, the God of Fire. As such it could not be wasted. It served to be the germinal fluid which the penitent waters did absorb into themselves and gave birth to the Āptyas—*Trīta*, *Dvīta* and *Ekata*. The legend thus symbolically explains the origin of the Āptyas.

The symbolical character of the legend lies in another respect also. It states the reasons for offering the water used for cleansing the dish and the fingers soiled during the preparation of the *purodāśa* to the Āptyas. The Āptyas, particularly the eldest of them, Trita, assisted Indra in his campaign against the Tvāstra Viśvarūpa, the three-headed demon-priest. With the help of Trita Indra succeeded in killing this priest who, though employed by the Gods as a *purohita*, really served the Asuras by secretly carrying the oblations to them. Such double-crossing of the Gods by their own *purohita* the Gods could not tolerate. Indra at their instance and with the assistance of the Āptya Trita chopped off the heads of the demon-priest and thus punished him in the manner he rightly deserved. But soon did he realise that in killing the demon-priest he committed the heinous crime of *brahma-hatyā*—killing a Brāhmaṇa and there too a Brāhmna who officiated as a priest. He was terribly afraid of facing the consequences. The Gods also sincerely desired that their Lord and leader should be acquitted of the guilt and thought that this could be done by transferring the guilt to some one. They chanced upon the Āptyas who had abetted Indra in his crime. They thereupon transferred the guilt to the Āptyas who had no other alternative but to accede to this transfer since the motif behind it was to absolve Indra of the sin of *brahmahatyā*. When the sacrificer pours out the water used for cleansing the dish and fingers in honour of the Āptyas he transfers whatever sin he might have incurred during the preparation of the *purodāśa* to them.

It is to be noted here that the legend declares that the preparation of the ceremonial rice-cake involved sin. As the offering of a rice-cake to one deity or another formed the main part of a Vedic sacrifice and as the preparation of such a rice-cake is declared here and in many other passages from the Brāhmaṇas to be an undertaking that involved sin or guilt it can be safely presumed that even in the days of the Brāhmaṇas public opinion was gradually growing against the institution of sacrifice. There were not a few cultured and intelligent men who looked upon the Vedic sacrifice with abhorrence and

probably felt that their fate was due to their being chosen as Hotṛ - priest by the Gods. He evidently did not wish that the same fate should overtake him. He therefore concealed himself in the immediately available hiding place viz. the waters and expected that the waters would not betray him to the Gods. The Gods however were determined to have Agni at least in its fourth and last form, as their hotṛ priest. They found him concealed in the waters dragged him out and made him accept the priestly office. This naturally enraged Agni. He could not however ventilate his anger on the Gods as they were too powerful for him. Having been convinced that his present fate which was unwholesome from his point of view was due to his being betrayed by the waters he was wild with them. Nobody could find fault with Agni in this respect. To escape from the Gods Agni concealed himself in the waters whom he thought to be the safest place of refuge. He least expected that this safest place of refuge would open its portals to the Gods and thus betray him to them. When the least expected became a reality and when Agni found himself in a situation which he had tried to avoid until then he lost all control over himself and spat on the treacherous waters thus expressing his utter disregard for them and his complete disapproval of their perfidious conduct. In this Agni has shown a perfectly natural trait. How many of us would control ourselves if placed in the situation as Agni! We have to absolve Agni of weakness of mind. It was not a weakness but a natural re-action to the treachery of the waters. Such a faithless conduct could go hardly unpunished in the domain of worldly or practical wisdom.

But, out of evil cometh good. The treachery of the Gods proved to be the cause of the origin of the Āptyas. Agni spat on the faithless waters. It was the *nipkṛtsa* of Agni, the God of Fire. As such it could not be wasted. It served to be the germinal fluid which the penitent waters did absorb into themselves and gave birth to the Āptyas—*Trīta*, *Dvīta* and *Ekata*. The legend thus, symbolically explains the origin of the Āptyas.

The symbolical character of the legend lies in another respect also. It states the reasons for offering the water used for cleansing the dish and the fingers soiled during the preparation of the *purodāśa* to the Āptyas. The Āptyas, particularly the eldest of them, Trita, assisted Indra in his campaign against the Tvāstra Viśvarūpa, the three-headed demon-priest. With the help of Trita Indra succeeded in killing this priest who, though employed by the Gods as a *purohita*, really served the Asuras by secretly carrying the oblations to them. Such double-crossing of the Gods by their own *purohita* the Gods could not tolerate. Indra at their instance and with the assistance of the Āptya Trita chopped off the heads of the demon-priest and thus punished him in the manner he rightly deserved. But soon did he realise that in killing the demon-priest he committed the heinous crime of *brahma-hatyā*—killing a Brāhmaṇa and there too a Brāhmaṇa who officiated as a priest. He was terribly afraid of facing the consequences. The Gods also sincerely desired that their Lord and leader should be acquitted of the guilt and thought that this could be done by transferring the guilt to some one. They chanced upon the Āptyas who had abetted Indra in his crime. They thereupon transferred the guilt to the Āptyas who had no other alternative but to accede to this transfer since the motif behind it was to absolve Indra of the sin of *brahmahatyā*. When the sacrificer pours out the water used for cleansing the dish and fingers in honour of the Āptyas he transfers whatever sin he might have incurred during the preparation of the *purodāśa* to them.

It is to be noted here that the legend declares that the preparation of the ceremonial rice-cake involved sin. As the offering of a rice-cake to one deity or another formed the main part of a Vedic sacrifice and as the preparation of such a rice cake is declared here and in many other passages from the Brāhmaṇas to be an undertaking that involved sin or guilt it can be safely presumed that even in the days of the Brāhmaṇas public opinion was gradually growing against the institution of sacrifice. There were not a few cultured and intelligent men who looked upon the Vedic sacrifice with abhorrence and

contempt and who in course of time led the revolt against that institution which had lost all of its glory and the noble idea of self-sacrifice but which had degenerated into an instrument in the hands of the priestly caste which exploited it for its ulterior purpose or end. That the Vedic sacrifice which was noble in its conception had deteriorated into a flexible lever in the hands of the priestly community this legend itself demonstrates. If we judge the action of Indra and the Āptyas, particularly Trita in killing the traitor Viśvarūpa by modern standards it is not at all a cognisable offence. Indra and the Āptyas could be exonerated of the crime by civilized public opinion. On the contrary they will be complimented for acting in the interest of the community by putting an end to the fifth columnist's activity in the community. But what actually do we find in the legend? Indra instead of receiving compliments from his kith and kin in whose interest he acted is accused of a heinous crime and is terribly afraid of facing the consequences. He is relieved when the sin of *brāhmaṇyā* is transferred to the Āptyas. The legend thus conveys that a divinity like Indra who killed the Tvīṣṭra to remove a social evil was accused of *brāhmaṇyā* because he killed a priest irrespective of the fact that the victim was a demon and traitor too. This could not have been possible unless the priestly community had a tremendous hold over the institution of the sacrifice and hence over the society in the Brahmanic period.

This is further demonstrated by the third and the last part of the legend dealing with the expedient adopted by the Āptyas to transfer their guilt to some one else. Reluctant that they were to carry the guilt brought over to them for no fault of theirs, they transferred the guilt to one who would offer a gift at a sacrifice without an adequate gift (*dakṣiṇ*) to the officiating priest or priests. The legend thereupon sermonizes that no *yajamāna* or sacrificer should offer any gift to any deity at any sacrifice without greasing the hand of the officiating priest for otherwise the sin of *brāhmaṇyā* would be transferred to him. No sacrificer would like to risk this. All sacrificial offerings are therefore presented to the deities with adequate *dakṣiṇ* to the priest officiating at the function.

This again could not have been possible unless the priestly community influenced the functioning of the then society

The fore-going discussion shows why this legend should be regarded as a mainly symbolical narrative. It symbolically explains (1) the origin of the Āptya Devatās—Trita, Dvita and Ekata, (2) the reason for offering the water used for cleansing the dish and the fingers in honour of the Āptyas and (3) why a gift should not be made without a *dakṣinā* to the priest at a sacrifice

But, what light does the legend throw upon the origin and character of the Āptyas—particularly Trita? Trita Āptya is a Rgvedic deity of course⁵. He is not celebrated or praised in one entire hymn but references to him are scattered all over the *Rgveda* in forty-passages from twenty-nine different hymns. The *Atharva-veda* mentions Trita Āptya in some passages. Corresponding to Trita Āptya in the *Rgveda* and the *Atharva-veda* we find Thrīta or Thraetona in the *Avesta*. From these references in the *Avesta* it could be concluded that Trita is a deity belonging to the Indo-Iranian period.

From all these references no definite information could be gathered as regards the original nature of Trita Āptya. Scholars are divided as regards the nature of this Deity owing to the paucity of evidence and consequently express divergent views. Thus Roth thinks that Trita Āptya was a Water and Wind Deity, Hillebrandt regards him as the 'Deity of the bright sky'. Perry believes that he was the 'God of the storm older than Indra'. Pischel first understood him to be a 'Sea-God' or 'God of the waters', but later modified his opinion and concluded that he was only the first human healer who was later on deified.

Though opinions are divided as regards the nature of this Deity, the evidence presented by the *Rgveda*, the *Atharva-veda* and the *Avesta* agrees in respect of Trita's origin and activity.

5 See Macdonell's *Vedic Mythology*, Strass-burg 1897, pp 67ff. Also "The Religious Quest of India" Ed. by J. N. Farquhar and H. D. Griswold, Oxford University Press, 1923, pp 298f.

contempt and who in course of time led the revolt against that institution which had lost all of its glory and the noble idea of self-sacrifice but which had degenerated into an instrument in the hands of the priestly caste which exploited it for its ulterior purpose or end. That the Vedic sacrifice which was noble in its conception had deteriorated into a flexible lever in the hands of the priestly community this legend itself demonstrates. If we judge the action of Indra and the Āptyas, particularly Trita, in killing the traitor Viśvarūpa by modern standards it is not at all a cognisable offence. Indra and the Āptyas could be exonerated of the crime by civilized public opinion. On the contrary they will be complimented for acting in the interest of the community by putting an end to the fifth columnist's activity in the community. But what actually do we find in the legend? Indra instead of receiving compliments from his kith and kin in whose interest he acted is accused of a heinous crime and is terribly afraid of facing the consequences. He is relieved when the sin of *brakmahatyā* is transferred to the Āptyas. The legend thus conveys that a divinity like Indra who killed the Tvāṣṭra to remove a social evil was accused of *brakmahatyā* because he killed a priest irrespective of the fact that the victim was a demon and traitor too. This could not have been possible unless the priestly community had a tremendous hold over the institution of the sacrifice and hence over the society in the Brahmanic period.

This is further demonstrated by the third and the last part of the legend dealing with the expedient adopted by the Āptyas to transfer their guilt to some one else. Reluctant that they were to carry the guilt brought over to them for no fault of theirs, they transferred the guilt to one who would offer a gift at a sacrifice without an adequate gift (*dakṣiṇā*) to the officiating priest or priests. The legend thereupon sermonises that no *yajamāna* or sacrificer should offer any gift to any deity at any sacrifice without greasing the hand of the officiating priest for otherwise the sin of *brakma-hatyā* would be transferred to him. No sacrificer would like to risk this. All sacrificial offerings are therefore presented to the deities with adequate *dakṣiṇā* to the priest officiating at the function.

This again could not have been possible unless the priestly community influenced the functioning of the then society

The fore-going discussion shows why this legend should be regarded as a mainly symbolical narrative. It symbolically explains (1) the origin of the Āptya Devatās—Trita, Dvita and Ekata, (2) the reason for offering the water used for cleansing the dish and the fingers in honour of the Āptyas and (3) why a gift should not be made without a *dakṣinā* to the priest at a sacrifice

But, what light does the legend throw upon the origin and character of the Āptyas—particularly Trita? Trita Āptya is a Rgvedic deity of course⁵. He is not celebrated or praised in one entire hymn but references to him are scattered all over the *Rgveda* in forty-passages from twenty-nine different hymns. The *Atharva-veda* mentions Trita Āptya in some passages. Corresponding to Trita Āptya in the *Rgveda* and the *Atharva-veda* we find Thrīta or Thraetona in the *Avesta*. From these references in the *Avesta* it could be concluded that Trita is a deity belonging to the Indo-Iranian period.

From all these references no definite information could be gathered as regards the original nature of Trita Āptya. Scholars are divided as regards the nature of this Deity owing to the paucity of evidence and consequently express divergent views. Thus Roth thinks that Trita Āptya was a Water and Wind Deity, Hillebrandt regards him as the 'Deity of the bright sky'. Perry believes that he was the 'God of the storm older than Indra'. Pischel first understood him to be a 'Sea-God' or 'God of the waters', but later modified his opinion and concluded that he was only the first human healer who was later on deified.

Though opinions are divided as regards the nature of this Deity, the evidence presented by the *Rgveda*, the *Atharva-veda* and the *Avesta* agrees in respect of Trita's origin and, activi-

⁵ See Macdonell's *Vedic Mythology*, Strass-burg 1897, pp 67ff. Also "The Religious Quest of India" Ed. by J. N. Farquhar and H. D. Griswold, Oxford University Press, 1923, pp 298f.

tica The epithet *Āptya* accompanies and alternates with *Trita* in the *Rgveda*. It is derived from *āp* and shows that the origin of *Trita* lay in the waters. *Rgveda* describes him as the associate of *Indra*, the *Maruta* and *Soma*. He is said to have scored a victory over *Vjtra*. In the company of *Indra* he slew the three headed son of *Tvaṣṭr* and released the cows. He appears as the companion of *Indra* in his *Soma* bout and prepares and purifies the *ollixir* evidently for *Indra*. In some passages of *Rgveda* we are told that in addition to the remarkable feat of slaying the demon he is associated with the *Maruta* in the thunder-storms, he finds *Agni*, kindles him and takes up his abode in human dwellings clearly as a form of *Agni*. The passages from the *Atharva-veda* add no definite information but only suggest the idea of a remote God to whom guilt or dream is transferred. In the *Avesta* *Thrita* is depicted as a man. The exploit of the Vedic *Trita* viz. the slaughter of the three-headed six-eyed demon or dragon is transferred to a cognate person *Thraetona* who like *Thrita*, is undoubtedly the *Avestan* counterpart of the Vedic *Triti*.

Coming to the evidence of the *Brāhmanas* we notice that the *Āptyas*—*Trita*, *Dvita* and *Ekata* are mentioned together for the first time in one and the same passage. There are two passages in which such a reference occurs—one from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, viz. the passage that is discussed here and the other from the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* III II-8-10-11. Nowhere else the *Āptyas* are mentioned together. At *Rv* VIII 47 16 *Dvita* is mentioned beside *Trita* but *Ekata* seems to be unknown to this *Veda*. *Sāyana* on *Rv* I 105 quotes a story of the *Sātyāyanins* in which the brothers *Trita*, *Dvita* and *Ekata* are called *Rjās*. *Trita* is thrown into a well by his other two brothers. Though we get a reference to *Ekata* here by the side of *Trita* and *Dvita*, *Ekata* seems to me to be the invention of the *Brāhmanas*. This was done evidently to explain the names *Trita* and *Dvita* which have a numerical

6. *śaḥ angarāṃ āpāḥ bhyaṣṭāyāt tātāḥ kātāḥ jyataḥ. śaḥ, dvāḥ yam bhyaṣṭāyāt tātāḥ dvitāḥ jyataḥ. śaḥ tṛtīyam bhyaṣṭāyāt tātāḥ tritāḥ jyataḥ yad dbyāḥ jyataḥ tad āpyāḥām āpyatām*

sense Further, the two passages from the Brāhmanas agree as regards the origin and the nature of these deities They were created from the waters and were the forms of Agni. The information that the Śatapatha legend gives as regards their activities is obviously based upon the cumulative evidence of the *Rgveda*, the *Atharvaveda* and the *Avesta*. The Āptyas particularly Trita—is described in the story as the companion of Indra in his fight against the three-headed six-eyed son of Tvastr It should be noted that the legend does not speak of this Trita as an associate of any other deity as the *Rv* does Again, the legend specifically states that Trita was only an associate of Indra in his fight against the demon He did not perform the feat himself as the *Rgveda* tells us The *Rgveda* does not associate the transference of guilt to Trita Āptya but the Brāhmana story, following the *Atharvaveda*, explicitly mentions that the sin of *brahmahatyā* of which the main actor in the drama, viz. Indra was mortally afraid, was quietly transferred to the Āptyas The latter no doubt meekly submitted to this humiliating treatment but in their turn passed the guilt on to an impious sacrificer

All this shows that in the Brahmanic period the origin, nature and characteristics of the Āptya devatās—Trita, Dvita and Ekata had become stabilised The names Trita, Dvita and Ekata were interpreted for the first time in their numerical sense but the deities associated with the names were regarded as 'water and fire' deities—associates of Indra in its fight against the son of Tvastr, to whom the sin of '*brahma-hatyā*' was subsequently transferred The Brāhmanas thus have intelligently made use of the evidence presented by the *Rgveda*, the *Atharvaveda* and the *Avesta* to stabilise the nature and characteristics of the Āptya devatās and remove the confusion or misconception about them

The foregoing discussion on the legend about the origin of the Āptyas shows that the story is not merely a symbolical narrative but a tale telling us to what extent the priestly community dominated over the then social structure, how the

sacrifice was an instrument in the hands of this community and how it was used to feather its own nest. It also enlightens us as regards the origin, nature and characteristics of the Aptya devatās Trita Devita and Ekata. There are innumerable legends in the Brāhmanas which are associated with one Vedic deity or the other. Such Deity Legends if properly studied will help us to correlate the mythology of the Veda with that of the Brāhmanas.

HARISVĀMIN THE COMMENTATOR OF THE ŚATAPATHA-BRĀHMAṆA : A PROTÉGÉ OF VIKRAMĀDITYA THE GREAT OF TRADITION HIS DATE — C. 54 B. C.

BY SHRI SADASHIVA L. KATRE

Harisvāmin is known to us mainly through his monumental commentary (Bhāṣya) on the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* of the Mādhyandina Recension of White Yajurveda. No other work by him appears to have yet been recorded with authenticity. Aufrecht,¹ probably following some previous scholar, had identified him with Harihara the commentator on Kātyāyana's *Śrāddhasūtra* and *Snānavidhīsūtra*. But P. V. Kane² has now proved the identity of this Harihara with Harihara the commentator on Pāraskara's *Gṛhyasūtra* and assigned him to c. 1150–1250 A. C. In fact, there was no ground whatsoever to justify even a tentative identification of our Harisvāmin with Harihara under question. Thus for a consideration of the various problems concerning our author we have naturally to look back only to his *Śatapatha-bhāṣya*.

The Bhāṣya has been declared both by old-type Panditas and modern scholars as very learned and evincing deep scholarship and unique conversance with the Vedic sacrificial ritual. It is, however, rendered awfully obscure and unintelligible in many portions due to extreme corruptness of the basic MSS. In fact, the Bhāṣya is as yet available to us only in fragments, and MSS of a major portion thereof still remain to be traced. MSS of the fragments hitherto recorded belong to the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, the Government MSS Library of the Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, Poona, the Oriental Institute of

1 *Catalogus Catalogorum*, I, Pp. 631, 762, 763

2 *History of Dharmaśāstra*, I, Pp. 341–343

the Madras University the India Office Library London the Bodleian Library Oxford etc and many of these fragments or selections therefrom have been included by Weber Satya-vrata Samasrami and Sridhara Annamstri Vare in their respective editions of the *Satapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa* issued from Berlin Calcutta and Bombay The last-named editor has published *Harivāmin's* fragments mainly because Śāyana's or Siṅgha's *Bhāṣya* which forms the main bulk of his edition³ was not available to him on those portions

The author's name *Harivāmin* and his designation *Ācārya* (i. e. a Vedic preceptor) are mentioned in the following colophon occurring in the printed editions at the close of each available section (*brāhmaṇa*) and chapter (*adhyāya*) —

इति श्रीमद्वाचास्पदहस्तिस्वामिना कृता सतपथब्राह्मणमाध्याये
अध्याया समाप्तः " or अध्याये ब्राह्मणम्, "

Yet by far important from the point of view of his personal details are the following three verses that generally precede this colophon —

नागस्वामिस्तुतोऽयस्स्यो पाराशर्यो वसन् हरिः ।
मुत्सर्प ईर्ष्यामास सक्तिः पौष्करियका ॥ १ ॥
श्रीमतोऽवन्तिनायस्य विक्रमाश्वस्य मृपतेः ।
धर्माश्वसो हरिस्वामी व्याख्येयसतपथी कृतिम् ॥ २ ॥

3 The edition has been published by the Lokahit Vankateshvara Press Bombay in 1940 in five volumes and references in this paper are to this edition. *Harivāmin* fragments published herein are on I vii 4 viii ix IV iv vi; VIII iv 4 v-vii XII XIII

4 Some of these colophons in the edition read : इति श्रीसर्वविद्याविधान-कवीन्द्राचार्यहरस्वामीना श्रीहरिस्वामिना कृता माध्यामिनीयसतपथब्राह्मणमाध्याये ... काण्डे अध्याय समाप्तः ॥ I am inclined to think that this mixed and misleading colophon has its origin in the confusion of some ill-informed scribe whose prototype MS of *Harivāmin's Satapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa* probably came from Kavindrīśvarya's collection and bore the usual ownership epigraph श्रीसर्वविद्याविधानकवीन्द्राचार्यहरस्वामीना माध्यामिनीयसतपथब्राह्मणमाध्यायम् on the title page. However the new *Catalogue of the Apsara Sanskrit Library* (P 31) published in 1944 too, records MS of *Satapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa* by Kavindrīśvarya.

भूभर्वा विक्रमार्केण क्लृप्ता कनकवेदिकाम् ।

दत्तायाध्यास्य कृतवान् श्रुत्यर्थविवृतिं हरि ॥ ३ ॥

However, in a few cases the verses are altogether absent, at some places we read only Verses 1 and 2 and at others only Verse 2, sometimes with the reading 'विक्रमार्केस्य भूपते,' replaced with one of the parallel readings 'विक्रमार्कक्षितीक्षितु', 'विक्रमादित्यभूपते' or 'विक्रमार्केस्य शासितु'

As per Verse 1, Harisvāmin belonged to a Brāhmaṇa family of Parāśara Gotra, was son of Nāgasvāmin, hailed originally from Puskara and had become a resident of Avantī or Ujjayinī when he wrote the present Vedic commentary Verse 2 says that Harisvāmin when he commented on the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* had been appointed Dharmādhyakṣa (i.e. Head of Religious Judiciary) by King Vikramāditya the gracious Lord of Avantī Verse 3 adds that Harisvāmin composed the Vedic commentary while physically occupying the high golden seat constructed by King Vikramāditya for 'Charity' This may mean either that Harisvāmin also held the post of Dānādhyakṣa (i.e. Head of Charitable Department) of that King or that the particular golden seat had been actually made over to Harisvāmin as a gift by way of appreciation of his learning by the King 'Śrutyarthavivṛti' in Verse 3 may have been designed to be the title of the Bhāṣya, or the compound may have been used only in a general sense (viz interpretation of Vedic text)

A few additional and still more important personal details are furnished by some verses which are traced in a solitary MS dated Samvat 1849 (= c. 1792 A.C.) stocked in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, and said to contain the beginning of the Bhāṣya I have not yet been able to see the MS myself and my scanty knowledge about it is derived only from the pertinent learned papers etc hitherto contributed by Mangala Deva Sastri,⁵ Lakshman Sarup,⁶ C. Kunhan

5 Vide R. N. Dandekar *Vedic Bibliography* (Bombay, 1946), P. 29

6 Vide his Introduction to *Indices and Appendices to the Nirukta* (Lahore, 1929), Pp. 29-30, and his paper *Date of Śaṅkarasvāmin in the Jhā Commemoration Volume* (Poona, 1937), Pp. 399-410

Raja⁷ and K. Sambasiva Sastrī⁸. Unluckily the verses under reference have been cited not fully but only partly and those too not very systematically. From a collective perusal of these papers etc. the following six verses from the MS can be furnished here :—

नागस्वामी तत्र

श्रीपशिलस्वामिसूतुभीगुहस्वामिनम्वनः ।

तन्मन्त्राजी प्रमाणम् आख्या कथम्वा समेक्षितः ॥

तन्मन्त्रो हरिस्वामी प्रकुपरेवैविमात् ।

अधीष्टात्तन्मन्त्रोऽधीतन्त्रो गुरोर्मुखात् ॥

वा सन्नम् कृत्वात् सप्त सोमसंस्वास्तमर्चमुक्तिम् ।

स्वात्वा हस्तप्यापदम्ना हरिस्वाम्यस्याम्यसि मे गुरा ॥

तन्मन्त्रोऽधीतमन्त्रो विचोदकृतिरेतये ।

प्याक्षिप्वात्तु गुरोर्त्वं हरिस्वामी वती गुरुम् ॥

श्रीमन्तोऽवन्तिनाथस्य विष्णुस्य सितीशितुः ।

अर्माप्यसो हरिस्वामी प्याक्वा कुर्वे वधामपि ॥

यवादीनां कलेर्जग्मुः सप्तविंशच्छतानि वै ।

अत्थारिशासमाख्यास्तदा माप्यमिदं कृतम् ॥

Of these the first five verses occur in the opening portion of the MS and the last one occurs at its end.

From these verses we learn that Nāgasvāmin Harisvāmin's father was son of Guhasvāmin and grandson of Pakṣasvāmin was deeply versed both practically and theoretically in the sacrificial lore and was endowed with affluent circum-

7 Vide his Preface to the *Āgastyaśrautamantra* 1. Madhavabharya (Madras, 1912). Vide *Vedic Bibliography* Pp 3 4 5 6 for his other papers etc. on the old problems.

8 Vide his Introduction to the *Āgastyaśrautamantra* with the *Āgastya* of Shandilya and the Commentary of Prabhakaraśastrya I (Tirumala, 1929).

stances What is more important, they inform us that Harisvāmin's guru was Skandasvāmin who, a great sacrificial priest (*śamrāt*),⁹ had performed the seven Soma sacrifices and had composed a commentary on the *Rgveda*. The fact of Harisvāmin's being Dharmādhyakṣa of King Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī is also recorded herein. Most important of all, the last verse records Harisvāmin's date by stating, according to its simple and apparent interpretation, that the Bhāṣya was completed when the first 3740 years of Kali had elapsed, i. e. 638 or 639 A. C. since Kali is held to commence from the 18th February, 3102 B. C.

Now let us examine all these details critically. There is nothing inconsistent in a Brāhmana of Harisvāmin's brilliance and acquisitions to hail originally from Puṣkara and receive a significant, learned and holy appointment at the then Court of Ujjayinī, for, after all, the two sacred places are not at an unreasonable distance from each other. Even today we find several families of Puṣkara Brāhmanas of the same gotra known as 'Puṣkaranā or Pokharanā Parāsarīs' settled at Ujjayinī for several generations. From the current representatives of some ancient shrines at Ujjayinī it appears that the name 'Nāgasvāmin' or 'Nāganātha' was popular there at one time. Some of the present members, too, of the Puṣkara Brāhmana families residing at places in Central India and Rajputana are

9 'Samrāt' here has to be explained in the sense "a sacrificial priest *par excellence* versed in the mathematical side of the construction of Kuṇḍa-maṇḍapa". This will be clear from the fact that Rāma Vājapeyin, the great sacrificer of Naimiṣa, styles both himself and his father Sūryadāsa as 'Samrāḍagnicit' or 'Samrāṭsthapatyagnicit' in the colophons to his numerous works on Śrauta, Kuṇḍamaṇḍapa, Jyautiṣa, etc. and that Raghunātha-bhaṭṭa of Benares a nephew of Jagadguru Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa and a performer of Vājapeya Sacrifice, also styles himself 'Samrāṭsthapati' in his work. K. Samhaṣiṣa Sastri's view (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. XCVI, Introduction, P. 3) that Skandasvāmin probably hailed from the Samrāt or Tamprakkal Brāhmana community of Kerala, though supported by the citation of a definition of such a *śamrāt* from the *Jātunirṇaya*, is not tenable since the definition has nothing to do with, or even goes against, the performance of Soma sacrifices which forms the predominant feature of Harisvāmin's description of Skandasvāmin.

known to me as bearing names ending with Svāmī which has thus become a sort of surname in their cases. Harīsvāmī a guru mentioned in the verses, too has been identified with utmost plausibility with the celebrated Skandasvāmī whose ancient Bhāṣya entitled *Rgārthāṅganāsāhitya* on the *Rāsamāhātmya* has been partly recovered and published lately from Trivandrum¹⁰ and Madras¹¹ in the metrical colophons¹² whereof he describes himself as son of Bhartṛdhruva (= Dhruvasvāmī?) and resident of Valabhi¹³ probably the same as its namesake of historical fame in Gujarat about the same distance from Ujjayinī as Puṣkara though in a different direction.

It is however impossible to trace Harīsvāmī a patron in history in the light of the above mentioned date since no Vikramāditya could have flourished at Ujjayinī at such a late date as 638 A. C. From 606 to 648 A. C. Harṣavardhana of Kanauj was the unchallenged emperor of the whole of Northern India and all the known historical details combine to point to the

10. The Trivandrum Sanskrit Series has published only the first three Adhyāya of the 1st Aṣṭaka of the *Rāsamāhātmya* with the commentaries of Skandasvāmī and Venkatasādhava under the editorship of K. Sambasiva Sastrī and L. A. Ravi Varma.

11. The Madras University Sanskrit Series, No. 8 has published the whole of the 1st Aṣṭaka of Skandasvāmī's Bhāṣya on *Rāsamāhātmya* under the editorship of C. Kumhar Rajs who has lately also procured transcript for the Adya Library of palm-leaf MS in Malayalam script from Trivandrum containing the 5th and 6th Aṣṭakas of the same Bhāṣya. Vide the *Adya Library B. Lists V 1 I Part 4* Pp 123-128.

12. The colophon reads:-

वसुधैवकुटुम्बकस्तु वसुधैवकुटुम्बकस्तु वसुधैवकुटुम्बकस्तु ।

सर्वभूतसुखं सर्वभूतसुखं सर्वभूतसुखं सर्वभूतसुखं ॥

13. K. Sambasiva Sastrī suggests the identity of this Valabhi with the village V Japattana near Kannur in the Calicut District of Central Kerala because *radhyas* names to meet with, according to his information, only in Kerala. Further he also identifies Bhartṛdhruva, Skandasvāmī with King Dhruvabhata of Valabhi in Gujarat, who was son-in-law of Emperor Harṣavardhana of Kanauj, quite forgetting apart from the gross absurdity of the identification the the date 639 A. C. upheld by him for Harīsvāmī's literary activities would seriously conflict with his suggestion.

fact that as the result of a series of conquests by Prabhākara-vardhana, Rājyavardhana and Harsavardhana himself, Mālava, both Western and Eastern including Avantī, had been bodily annexed to the empire of Kanauj long before 638 A C. Consequently Avantī could not have a Vikramāditya about this period since that dignified name or title connotes something even more than an independent king or emperor.

Most of the scholars mentioned above have accepted 638 or 639 A C as Harisvāmin's date but they have not succeeded in identifying his Vikramāditya. Only Lakshman Sarup has strived hard to get rid of the difficulty and identify the royal patron, but his methods, arguments and results are hardly acceptable. In the beginning¹⁴ he was labouring under the impression that Kali started in 3202 B C, so that the date furnished by the verse could be easily rendered as 538 A C and the patron could at once be identified with King Yaśodharman who is known to have vanquished Mihirakula the Lord of the Hūnas about 528 A C. Soon he detected that it was a blunder to have made the Kali era start from 3202 B C and that actually it is held to start exactly a hundred years later in 3102 B C so that the year under reference could be calculated only as 638 A C when for the reasons stated above Avantī or Mālava could have no Vikramāditya and his identification proved futile. However, the temptation to identify the patron with Yaśodharman was perhaps too irresistible for Lakshman Sarup! He subsequently¹⁵ declared the reading of the verse as faulty and proposed the following emendation for the same from his own imagination —

यदाब्दानां कलेर्जग्मुः पट्षिंशच्छतकानि वै ।

चत्वारिंशत्समाश्चान्यास्तदा माप्यमिदं कृतम् ॥

so that the date could be again rendered as 538 A C and the already suggested identity, based originally as it was on erroneous information, could be substantially established!

No scholar following scientific methods of research can

14 *Indices and Appendices to the Nirukta*, Introduction, Pp 29-30

15 *Date of Skandasvāmin — Jhā Commemoration Volume*, Pp 399-410

accept a drastic and grossly imaginary emendation of an original reading in a MS simply to suit one's convenience unless it is supported by other scriptural evidence. The emendation *सुविमलवर्णानि* of the original reading *सुविमलवर्णानि* proposed as it is by a scholar of Lakshman Sarup a name and fame cannot but be rejected. After all the letters *स* and *व* as well as *वि* and *व* are not so similar in appearance as to be mutually transferable in transcription. We had rather dismissed for the time being the statement of the verse as untenable for want of historical corroboration until the affair could be mended by the discovery of a fresh MS with a happy reading or by the pertinent modification of our historical knowledge of the period.

Lakshman Sarup showed his partiality for Yasodharman on another novel ground too. He says that the description *Avantinātha* i.e. Lord of Avantī of Hariavāmin's Vikramāditya suits Yasodharman whose territory was confined to Malwa or Central India more than it does Candragupta II or other Gupta Vikramādityas whose sovereignty extended to the whole of Northern India or even beyond. The argument however is of no weight. Ancient authors like Hariavāmin were evidently not ignorant of the maxim *महात्मानो यत्रैव सन्ति*. Even in popular legends King Vikramāditya of tradition and King Bhoja are usually designated as *Avantinātha* and *Dhārādhīśa* respectively mainly because Avantī and Dhārā were their respective capitals although the theme that their sway extended over a considerably wider region is therein kept constantly in view. Further the argument would not help in establishing the identity of Hariavāmin's patron with Yasodharman too since places like Mandasor (Dadapura) which lie at a distance of over 100 miles from Ujjayinī are known to have been included in the latter's territory. Last but not the least Yasodharman cannot be identified with any Vikramāditya of history or tradition much less with Hariavāmin's Vikramāditya who is not even hinted to bear any other name. No evidence forthcoming that Yasodharman

ever bore the title Vikramāditya. Had he really borne that title he would not have failed to mention it in the course of his exhaustive self-eulogistic descriptions with which abound his hitherto discovered three inscriptions including the Mandasor Stone Inscription of 532 A. C.¹⁷ Many previous western as well as Indian scholars had strenuously exerted themselves to identify Śakāri Vikramāditya of tradition with this Hūnārī Yaśodharman of inscriptions, but their attempts, too, proved futile due to the absence of evidence for the latter's actually bearing the title Vikramāditya at any stage, erroneous view in regarding the Śakas and the Hūnas as identical and many other difficulties.

Thus Lakshman Sarup's treatment and solution of the problem are not at all convincing and acceptable.

One thing very conspicuous in the above-mentioned four scholars' approach to the problem is that none of them regards these verses as fabricated or doubts the genuineness of the author in furnishing all these details. On the contrary, most of them combine in making the date furnished by the author, traceable as it is in a single MS, as their main landmark for fixing the date of Skandasvāmin, notwithstanding the fact that the question of the identity of Harisvāmin's Vikramāditya remains on its basis unsolved. Thus C. Kunhan Raja and K. Sambasiva Sastri assign Harisvāmin to 638 A. C. and Skandasvāmin to c. 600 A. C., while Lakshman Sarup, who charges only the scribe of the Benares MS with inaccuracy of transcription, assigns Harisvāmin to 528 A. C. and Skandasvāmin to c. 500 A. C. Mangala Deva Sastri, Head of the institution in actual possession of the MS, describes the MS as 'unique' and says 'there is no reason why the date-furnishing verse therein should not be regarded as genuine'.¹⁸ Thus Harisvāmin has not been subjected to the

17 D. C. Sircar *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I (Calcutta, 1942), Pp. 386-392. Vide also Pp. 393-395 for Yaśodharman's another inscription at Mandasor.

18 *Indices and Appendices to the Nirukta*, Introduction, Pp. 29-30, where Lakshman Sarup quotes Mangala Deva Sastri's opinion.

ignominious fate of the ill famed author of the *Jyotirvidābhāṣa* who too furnishes his date and personal details in a somewhat similar way. The reason evidently is that the scholars have not found in the course of their study of Hariśvāmin a Bhāṣya anything internal that goes against such a date for the same while the *Jyotirvidābhāṣa* is notorious in furnishing many internal data that contradict its alleged date and details. We may readily concede the scholars' partiality for Hariśvāmin in this respect for this reason but no critic can pronounce their solutions of the problem as final so long as the historical identity of Hariśvāmin's Vikramāditya remains an unsolved riddle with them.

Probably we can get rid of the dilemma in a very happy way if the verse under question is explained as recently suggested by me elsewhere¹⁹ in the following way —

Prose Order : यदा कले, आर्यानां (सम्राज्ञां) सप्त च विराज्यमानि च
 वै जम्बुा जम्बुा जम्बुारिणाम् समाप्त च वै जम्बुा तदा
 ह्ये मातृव इत्यम् ॥

Simple Translation *This Bhāṣya was completed when the first 7 and 3000 and further 40 (i. e. 3047) years of Kali were over*

Thus, by divorcing *sapta* from *tribhacchatāni* in the verse the years of Kali that had elapsed would number 3047 and not 3740 so that the year under reference would be rendered as c. 54 B. C. This proposed process of interpreting the verse while being perfectly justified from the grammatical point of view dispels the necessity of making any imaginary alteration in the original MS reading. For thereby the royal patron is at once identified with Vikramāditya the Great of tradition who is reputed to be the founder of the Sāvat Era that commences from 57 B. C. or Kali year 3045.

From a consideration of all the relevant facts and factors together I am now convinced that the author of the verse

19. Vide my article in the *Hindi Vishva-Jyoti-Grahaṇa* (Barbet 2001) published from Gwalior P. 323.

could have nothing but this very meaning in his mind. The obvious implications of the meaning are that Harisvāmin was a protégé of Vikramāditya the Great of tradition, that his composition of the Bhāṣya was one of the great undertakings planned to commemorate the unique event of foundation of the Samvat Era by that King or Emperor who, most probably on that very occasion, conferred, in consonance with his traditional unrivalled generosity to the learned, a very rich gift of the lofty golden seat on his Dharmādhyakṣa the author, that the Bhāṣya was commenced in the 1st year and finished in the 3rd year of the Samvat Era, etc. The genuineness or otherwise of the statement of the verse and its implications would, of course, depend on pertinent internal and external circumstances.

Many objections would be naturally rushed forth by orientalists, historians and archaeologists against the proposed way of interpretation, but they are not likely to prove insurmountable. It might be asked how could 'sapta', a minor numeral, be made, against the usual convention, to precede 'triśaṣṭhatāni', a major numeral? The answer is it is simply due to the metrical convenience of the author. Ancient authors, much less Vedic or Śrauta commentators, should not always be expected to rigidly observe rhetorical conventions, which certainly were not so sacred to them as Pāṇini's dictates, in their writings. Even authors of ornate metrical compositions like the Kahaum Stone Pillar Inscription²⁰ of Skandagupta are found using forms like त्रिंशदशैकोत्तरशत- to mean 'one hundred and forty-one', which are against both rhetoric and grammar, simply because they fitted in their metres.

The most serious objection would be hurled by historians and archaeologists as to where is the historical evidence for

20 *Select Inscriptions*, I, P 309. The pertinent Verse 1 of this inscription dated 141 Gupta Era (= 460 A. C.) reads — यस्योपस्थानभूमिर्नृपतिशत-
शिरात्तवातावधूता गुप्तानां वंशजस्य प्रविश्रुतयशसस्तस्य सर्वोत्तमर्द्धे । राज्ये शक्रोप-
मस्य क्षितिपशतपते स्कन्दगुप्तस्य शान्ते वर्षे त्रिंशदशैकोत्तरकशततमे ज्येष्ठमासि
प्रपन्ने ॥

the actual existence of a Vikramāditya at this period? My answer is it is the contemporary literary allusions like the present ones that unless proved to be forged or fabricated or directly controverted by proved facts of history will prove his historical existence at this stage in the absence of a pertinent inscription to the effect and they should not be disparaged simply because they are not inscribed on stone or metal. Even the staunchest archaeologist as against his practice in the past, does not now dare to accord a flat denial to the existence of a Vikramāditya at Ujjayini c. 57 B. C. he now prefers only to postpone the acceptance of his existence till the discovery of a pertinent inscription. Even his most cherished view that there could have been no historical Vikramāditya prior to Candragupta II has been shattered recently with the sudden discovery in 1943 at Bannala in Indore State of a gold coin of Samudragupta bearing the legend Śrī-Vikramah on the reverse²¹. Vincent Smith had anticipated²² such a discovery long ago although a few die-hard adherents of the antiquated school are still exerting themselves to explain away its implications. The trend of scholars for some years past appears to be in favour of admitting an original Vikramāditya at Ujjayini if and when one comes historically in their view in the 1st century B. C., since no known facts of history are now found to go against his existence. Harivāṃśa statements the genuineness whereof has hitherto never been questioned by critics, should now be taken in the light of my interpretation of his date to form a contemporary direct evidence for his historical existence in the period.

A third likely objection would still creep up from the mere archaeologist to the purport that the use of the Kālī era is not supported at such an early stage in epigraphy which as matters stand today becomes acquainted with it only 35 centuries after its so-called commencement i. e. c. the 5th

21. Vide D. B. Dikshitar in *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India*, Vol. V Part II Pp. 136-137 for description and photograph of this coin.

22. *Early History of India* 4th edition (Oxford, 1924), P. 347

century A C ²³ The objection should be silenced by the same argument, viz, that Harisvāmin's use of the Kalī era should itself furnish a substantial proof for its earlier prevalence in the country Further, the Purānas, a considerable portion whereof is very early and is relied upon with some caution even by the modern historian as the only source when epigraphy keeps silence, bear ample testimony to the early popularity of the Kalī era The division of time into Kṛta, Tretā, Dvāpara and Kalī yugas or periods is known in some form or other even to the *Aitareya* and other Brāhmanas

Thus my interpretation of the date-furnishing verse is not likely to be impeded by these objections and we should now proceed to consider how far it is justified by external and internal conditions I have already mentioned that the scholars who have made a patient study of Harisvāmin's Bhāṣya for several years on the basis of its MSS as well as printed fragments have found therein nothing that goes against its assignment to 638 or even 538 A C From a close perusal of the printed fragments of the Bhāṣya I am able to say that nothing internal goes against its date being pushed back by seven centuries more For, Harisvāmin cites only the following works — ऋक्संहिता, वाजसनेयिसंहिता and तैत्तिरीयसंहिता, ऐतरेयब्राह्मण and तैत्तिरीयब्राह्मण, निघण्टु, निरुक्त and पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी, वातुपाठ and गणपाठ, कात्यायनश्रौतसूत्र, ²⁴ स्मृतिवचन located in शातर-

23 Fleet *JRAS*, 1911, P 479, and others

24 The *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra* is quoted numerously Vide especially passages like “ घ्नन्ति वा एतत् पशु यदेनम् । ‘ सज्ञप्यमाने ’ इति वचनात् परिपशव्यान्तराल इति प्राप्नोति । सूत्रकारस्तु — ‘ परिपशव्ये हुत्वा प्राणाय स्वाहेति तिस्रोऽपरा जुहोति ’ इत्याह । तस्याभिप्राय — सज्ञप्यमाने इति ‘ वर्तमानसामीप्ये वर्तमानवद्वा ’ इत्येवं वर्तमानोपदेशोऽप्यमिति । कुत ? ‘ प्राणानेवास्मिञ्चेतद्वाति ’ इति वावयशेषात् । उत्क्रान्तानां हि प्राणानां पुनर्विधानं युक्तं नानुत्क्रान्तानामिति । ” (—XIII ॥ 8, Pp 2865-6), “ सूत्रकारस्तु — परिकर्षणपक्षे परिकृष्टे एव यवान्वेदिति मेने । ” (—XIII viii 3, P 2982), etc where Harisvāmin appears to differ with Kātyāyana

Hindu, Jaina and Buddhist, ancient traditions of the country and references to him in Gunādhyā's *Bṛhatkathā*, Hāla's *Gāthāsaptasatī* and Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā*. It may be that this original Vikramāditya was in reality only a local king or emperor of Malwa marked mainly for his unique chivalry, munificence to poets and the learned, etc and that the current myths regarding his world-conquest etc. arose because later emperors like Samudragupta and Candragupta II made him their own prototype by bearing a title of his name and the traditions subsequently confounded him with all these

If Hariśvāmin flourished in 57 B C, both his father Nāgasvāmin and his guru Skandasvāmin have to be assigned to c 100-75 B C. There is nothing internal in the hitherto published portion²⁹ of Skandasvāmin's Bhāṣya on the *Rksamhitā*, too, that appears to contradict such an early date for its author. It may be pointed out here that Pুষ्यामित्रा Śunga who mainly on the basis of Purāṇic traditions had been previously assigned by historians³⁰ to c 180 B C is now being placed by some eminent epigraphists³¹ in c 100-75 B C on the strength of a recently deciphered undated Śunga inscription³² at Ayodhyā the script whereof is regarded by them to belong to the 1st century A C and wherein King Dhanadeva of Kosala describes himself as 'sixth in descent from Pুষ्यामित्रा who twice performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice'. If this new view flourishes, the sacrificial activities of both Nāgasvāmin and Skandasvāmin would with utmost plausibility be assigned actually to the Golden Age of ancient Vedic culture ringing with the slogans like "Pুষ्यामित्रम यājāmaḥ".

29 Skandasvāmin's Bhāṣya (I 1-3) quotes, besides some anonymous Vedic passages, only the following — ओष्येयब्राह्मण, ऐतरेयब्राह्मण, ऐतिहासिका, कात्यायन, चरकाध्वर्युब्राह्मण, छाङ्गलेयिभृति, निघण्टु, पाणिनि, पुराणेषु, पौराणिकाः, बृहदेवता and बृहदेवताकार, वार्तिकः on पाणिनि, शतपथब्राह्मण, शाङ्खायनब्राह्मण, and some शौनक, सरकाध्वर्युब्राह्मण अनुक्रमणः

30 Smith *Early History of India*, Pp 204, 208 ff

31 E g, N G Majumdar (*ABORI*, Vol VII, Pp 160-63), Dayaram Sahni (*Epigraphia Indica*, Vol XX, P. 57), etc

32 *Select Inscriptions*, I, P 96

Even if the old view regarding Pusyamitra's date survives the period 100-75 B C would still be one strongly echoing those slogans.

As C Kunhan Raja says,²³ our Hariśvāmin of Parāśara gotra is evidently different from his namesake mentioned in an inscription²⁴ dated 601 A C because the latter belongs to Bharadvāja gotra. K Sambasiva Sastri is inclined²⁵ to identify our Hariśvāmin with Hariśvāmin son of Govindaśvāmin and the author of the commentary *Jayamatigāḥ* on the *Bhāṭṭikāḥ* whose colophon he furnishes as —

इति सत्त्वविबूढामयिगाविम्वृत्तामिच्छुष्मीहरिश्चामिषिरश्चित्तमहात्म्य-
दीक्षायां भगवत्पुत्रपरमहंसपरिभाषकमिगदिवापां जयमङ्गलायां तिष्ठन्तकाशे
सुहृद्विभक्तिर्वै नन्दमा परिच्छेदः ॥

It is strange that such an identity should have been suggested by him in face of the different parentage of the two *Harisporina*!

Our Hariśvilkin could at once have been identified with the Hari mentioned as one of the numerous literary celebrities in the court of Vikramaditya in the following verse of the *Yatodiddharana* (228)—

सहस्रं सुभाषरश्मिर्मिराद्गुह्यतो
 विष्णुशिखोत्पलहरीं यद्वर्णराज्यः ।
 जगत्त्रयं सन्ति कथयोऽमरसिंहपूर्वा
 यत्सैव विष्णुमनुपश्य समासयोऽम्नी ॥

but how to rely on the details furnished by the infamous
Trotter & Abner?

31 Preface to the *Revelation of Medhavyabhaṅga*, P. xviii

34 *Epigraphia Indica* Vol. IX Pp 342ff

35 T vanderburg Sanskrit Series No XCVI Introduction, P 2.

THE HISTORICAL FACTS OF THE PERSONALITY AND REIGN OF VIKRAMĀDITYA

BY SARDAR M V KIBE

It is assumed by the Committee, which is to award prizes for the contribution on the subject of the title of this essay, that the Vikramāditya referred to is the Vikramāditya, who lived in the 1st Century B C and who founded the Vikrama era. The Committee has besides this guidance, also shown discretion in not prescribing any limit for its extent or bulk. The latter can be easily augmented by quotations.

The assumption by the Committee is fully supported by legend. There are two imaginative works in Sanskrit, whether original or translated from some other source, is not clear, which contain stories woven round the careers of the Vikramāditya, the reputed founder of the current Vikrama Samvat. One contains 25 stories and the other 32. The latter stories are told by thirty-two statutes on the throne, supposed to be that of Vikramāditya. They relate to him. The former describes exploits of Vikramāditya. Both these works are more interesting and didactic than based on facts of history. They are said to be of Buddhist Origin (1).

Then there is the Kālakācārya's Purāṇa of Jains which gives an account of this Emperor. It is said that he belonged to the Gardabhilla dynasty and that his brother was Bhartrhari, whose three centuries of stanzas on Erotics, Renunciation and Morality or Polity, are so well-known. A Bhartrhari is known as an author of some other works in Sanskrit. Whether all these were different or one and the same, is not certain, nor is the history of the latter supported by any other evidence than a legend based on the first named stanza of the first named hundred stanzas, which describes unfaithfulness of women. It is also not known in what order these

centuries of stanzas were composed or whether they are mere anthologies nor is it known if they are the creation of one author or different ones. The 25 stories told to Vikrama support the legend mentioned above. The *Kathasaritsagara* also mentions a Vikramāditya and gives some account of him.

The Jain Purāṇa, however describes that Bhartṛhari retired from the worldly affairs and Vikrama succeeded him. Some coins with the picture of an animal like an ass have been found but it is not established whether the name Gardhabhilla dynasty is the foundation or the coins are the foundations of the story. Vikramāditya in spite of his prowess conquests and success seems to have been the last brilliant king of the dynasty. And there is another story that Vikrama's era was ousted by that of Śalivāhana who established his era after 135 years. It is supported by a stanza in a Sanskrit astronomical work describing the name of three past and three future founders of eras among the first three being Dharmarāja, Vikrama and Śalivāhana. Prof. Egerton has mainly relied on this Jain work. It is also a production of the 13th century A. D. and appears to be based on the works previously mentioned.

The late Rao Bahadur C. V. Vaidya the eminent historian of the pre-Muslim period pointed out that in *Hala's Saptaśati* there is a stanza, in which a King Vikrama of great powers is mentioned. According to Vaidya this work belongs to the 1st century B. C. but according to others this work is of much later origin even of the 7th century A. D. So far this has been the strongest evidence in the nature of the evidence of history. But all depends upon the period in which this work was written as far as its value to the present discussion is concerned. And in any case it gives no details.

Competent scholars have shown that there is nothing to show that the present Vikrama era has come down uninterrupted from its first century. In fact no trace of it is found till much later.

This is indeed the strongest argument against the history of its founder. It can, however, be said that the absence of evidence is no undisputable argument to disprove an ancient tradition. Something on stone, or some other evidence may yet be discovered, filling up this short-coming. But at present it dominates the minds of scholars.

On the other hand, the enumeration as contemporaries, of nine gems of learning supposed to be living at the time of Vikrama, in which is included the famous astronomer of Ujjain, Varāhamihira, whose date is sometime in the 6th century A D, found in a stanza in an astronomical work, shows the utter confusion prevailing in the minds of Indian Scholars, as regards, not only the date but the authenticity of the very existence of Vikramāditya. That there have been several kings, Emperors or conquerors of this name, from the time of the Guptas and that Cālukyas also produced some, is undoubted (2) and that the former were the first to invent, or assume the title, is certain so far as the present evidence is concerned (3).

Almost all the Western Scholars and a few of the Indians (4) bring down the date of the composition of at least some of the Sūktas of *Rgveda*, to 600 B C. On the other hand some of the Eastern Scholars would carry back the date of the Candragupta Maurya to the 16th Century B C (5).

Mr Trivedi (6) is of the opinion, that the sheet-anchor of the Indian History, fixed by Sir William Jones in the year 1795, viz the contemporaneousness of Alexander the Great and Candragupta Maurya, which is based on the similarity between the name Sandroktus and the former, given in the Greek records, and certain other facts, but which is not compatible with the original statements of the *Purānas* which were also known to the Greeks, is wrong (6). The average period of 20 or 25 years assigned to each reign of the kings named in the Purānic dynasties is also wrong because, (a) the reigns of some kings are known to be longer and (b) some names minor, or un-important kings, have been omitted, which can be proved from the treatment accorded to dynastic

names even in the so-called historical period fixed by the Western Scholars. According to Mr Mankad the Sandrokotus of the Greek was Samudra Gupta the son of Chandra Gupta I the founder of the Gupta dynasty (5). Hence the period of the Guptas is carried back by more than a thousand years. According to Dr H. P. Jaiswal the Guptas were Karsakar Jats (7). As the Guptas revived Hinduism which had gone down before the Budhas they were incorporated in the Ksatriya Varna and may thus have come to be regarded as one of the four-so called Agnikula - families born out of the Agni Kupda at Mount Abu but this story is of modern origin so also the statement that the Vikramaditya was a farmer is of later origin.

Mr Mankad in his paper already referred to (5) maintains that a Manvantara-Caturyuga computation of 40 years was in existence and the years of the dynasties given in the *Parāpas* which are upto the end of the Andhra dynasty are given in its terms. It appears that it was replaced by the Vikrama Satchvat, after an interregnum of about a few hundred years (9). The interregnum fell within the periods of the reigns of Candragupta I and the beginning of the reign of Skandagupta I who was the last Gupta king who defeated the Sakas or Hūnas. This will be presently supported. The later Guptas gradually faded.

If therefore the basis of the enumeration of the years of Caturyuga-Manvantara, given in the previous paragraph has a solid foundation Gautama Buddha's death is carried back to 1790 B. C. and of Asoka's reign to about three centuries later (5). From the Mauryas to the end of Andhras intervenes a period of about a thousand years. An interval of about six hundred years must be regarded as the dark age in history which is now held to be from the Mauryas to the Guptas. It is in this paper held to begin after the Guptas who are held to have existed in the fourth century to 1st century B. C. Indifferent attention has been paid to the references in existing literature for a history of this period. The late Dr Jaiswal in his Imperial History of India, based

on newly discovered works, such as *Kaumudīmahotsava* and *Mānījūṣṭi-mūlakalpa* has brought to light the *Vākātaka* Empire but it covered mid-India only between 150 and 350 A D, the pre-Gupta period as at present understood in accordance with the sheet-anchor of Sir William Jones

If, therefore, Candragupta I, or his son, Samudragupta, be held to be a contemporary of the invasion of Alexander and of Seleukus Nicator, a period of nearly three centuries is required to be filled up by the Guptas upto Skandagupta, who all called themselves Ādityas or Vikramādityas (5) or simply Parākrama, a variant of Vikrama (2) Saundagupta I, took the title of Vikramāditya. The names of those Imperial Guptas known upto now are Candragupta I, Rāmagupta, Samudragupta, Candragupta II, Kumārgupta and Skandagupta. The exact period to be counted being 275 years, to fit in Skandagupta with 56 B C, the average reign of these, comes to about 45 years. Now it is known that Candragupta reigned for 7 years, Rāmagupta only for a couple of, or less, years and Candragupta II for 51 years. Deducting these nearly 59 years of those three kings, the period of the reigns of the remaining three averages 90 years each, which is rather too long. The only surmise possible is that as in the dynastic names of individual kings given in the *Purāṇas*, some names of un-important rulers have been left out (14). As will be seen, the average for six kings is not inordinately long.

In one of the previous paragraphs reference has been made to the pre-Gupta, that is to say, the pre-Greek invasion period. The history of this period fits in well with the scattered information which can be culled from the *Vamśānu-carita* of the *Purāṇa*, commencing from Manu Vaivasvata, *Brhatkathā* which is now thought to be extant only in the shape of *Kathasaritsāgara* in Sanskrit, of the first Millenium of the Christian era, and which was in Paisācī language, probably in the 1st century B C, in the Gāthās of Jains, the stories in Bhāsa's dramas, the references in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* to Pradyota, Udayana, Vāsavadattā, Vatsarāja and in the

antiquity of Ujjain from the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa at least from that of the pre Aśoka period. So also do the story of the *Aśchakapika* and the conquests of Rāghu in *Rāghu-vaṇśa*.

Only four acts of Bhāsa's *Cārudatta* which is the basis of the same acts of *Aśchakapika* are available. Dr Oliver of the Illinois University (U S A) writes that Pālaka of the *Aśchakapika* was a son of Pradyota of Ujjain (8). This is based on Bhāsa's *Śvapnashatadattā*. It appears from the stories in Bhāsa's *Śvapnashatadattā* and *Aśchakapika* combined that on account of Udayana and Pālaka being competitors for the hand of the daughter of the king of Vatsa, viz. Padmāvatī, there was revolution at Ujjain and Pālaka was overthrown. He also appears to have been a tyrant like his father Pradyota who like Candragupta II bore the title of Candā Mahāseṇa (2).

In the Pañcāṅgas the names of the six founders of different eras are given. It is written therein that after a lapse of 135 years Vikrama Samvat was replaced. Ujjayinī was occupied by Candragupta II but it seems that it passed out of the hands of his descendants until it was re-conquered by Skandagupta I who according to what has been hitherto displayed reigned in the 1st century B. C. According to Dr Hemachandra Joshi D. Litt (10) a eulogy (अश्लिष) dated 63 V. S. has been found in the Deccan and another of the year 103 in the Punjab. He further says that mention of Vikrama is found in *Skandapurdā* and quotes Prof. Egerton as saying that a king having the title of Vikramāditya reigned at Ujjain in 57-56 B. C.

Although Skandagupta defeated the Hūṇas who may be Sakas or a mixture of both and maintained the glories of the Guptas, he became the last prominent king of the dynasty. It is said as already pointed out in a previous paragraph that Vikrama Samvat was superseded by Śālivāhana who started his own era after the 135 years of the former's era. This Śālivāhana was no doubt Śātsavāhana which was a Mahārāṣṭriya dynasty (11). It appears that there is a strange mixture of

dates in these two eras in subsequent literature That can be solved in this way Śālivāhana's era may have prevailed, even in the north of the Narbada but the sway of Sātavāhanas in these parts was interrupted by Kuśānas, Ksatrapas and others, who later ruled over Ujjain The subsequent king of these parts, who expelled or defeated the foreigners was Yaśodharman, who also called himself Vikramāditya The king who according to Alberuni defeated the Hūnas at Korur, was probably this king It appears from Bhavabhūti's dramas that the city of Ujjain had then assumed a secondary place This was probably after the Sātavāhanas had receded from these parts The name of Mālava Gana belongs to this period and continued even after Yaśodharman (12)

Dr R B Pande of the Benares Hindu University has, in a paper read before the 12th All India Oriental Congress at Benares, January, 1944, stated that there in the possession of Pandit Keshava Prasad Mishra, Head of the Department of Hindi, Benares Hindu University, is an old manuscript of *Śākuntala* "In it we find the personal name of the king in whose Assembly the drama was staged, was Vikramāditya and his title or *biruda* was Śaśānka" This is too simple as to seem revolutionary But before this inscription is given credence, the age of the manuscript, the age of the writing on it, and so on, will have to be tested by experts in these lines At present it is enough to record that it is at variance with the known facts

Skandagupta's claim to be the founder of the Vikrama era has circumstantial evidence in support It, however, lacks a connecting link between the Gupta era and the Vikrama era But if this hypothesis, that the first centuries of the era were known as the Gupta era, or was so called, (9) and then, when the Śālivāhana Śaka declined, it carried on its existence under the name of Malavagana, and after Yaśodharman had revived the glory of Malwa, although not of Avantī, which was razed to the ground, perhaps by such natural causes as earth-quakes, following the ravages of invaders attracted there, by its wealth and the weakness of its

ruled the era the founder of which was the Lord of Malwa and had his Capital at Ujjain was revived is accepted it will be supplied. It also appears from the chronology in ancient astronomical works that they indiscriminately used the name Śaka or Śakvat but the dates and months given are those which correspond to the Vikrama era. This shows that when the works were written there was some power which forcibly suppressed the name of Vikrama. This subject will require and is receiving separate treatment at the hands of a competent astronomical scholar.

There is ample evidence in Indian and Foreign literature to show that the city of Ujjain was a great centre of trade and was a rich city in centuries B C. The great poet Kālidāsa in his epic poem *Raghuvamśa* and his lyrical poem called *Meghadūta* has made appreciative references to the prosperity of Ujjain and has referred to the gay life of its citizens and the king. But scholars are not agreed as to the date of Kālidāsa. He is dragged down from the 1st Century B C to the 7th Century A D. But if the author of these two works and of *Kumārāsambhava*, is one and the same he can be definitely fixed up in the Gupta period.

In the Silver Jubilee Number of the J B O R I Mr Vasudeo Sharan Agrawal quotes the undermentioned stanza from the *Mahābhārata* —

अपापरोहस्पत कूपसेपहा । अलामहेकरवरो पुमान् ॥
 माकारवमे मतिमुपय ऊरुहै । इति च कन्व परिहस्ये कुमे ॥
 (विराटपर्व १ १)

About the Kuppālas designated here (माकारवम) he maintains that they are to be found in the ears of figures carved on the Barhut sculptures now in the Calcutta Museum. They are dated about 200 B C. An image of a Yakṣa dug up at Parkham near Mathurā which is dated prior to the above period has these in its ears. The image is in the Museum at Mathurā. But these ear ornaments are not found on any sculpture after the Śuṅga period. In those of the Kuruṇa period hanging Kuppālas — pendants — are found. It appears

that there had been change in the fashion. The Kundalas mentioned in *Virāṭaparva*, fit in square in the lobes of the ears, and on the back side they have a branch of the mythical tree, Kalpavṛkṣa. In Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava* they are mentioned thus —

रथस्य कर्णावभिसन्मुखस्य । ताटकचक्र द्वितीय न्यधात्स ॥ (९ २३)

In the ears of the images of the Gupta period these are found. In this period Makara-Kundalas, fish ear-ornaments had also come into use, but the ताटक चक्र Kundalas are not found before the Gupta period. This fact, and the insistence on the gay life of the otherwise inconspicuous king of Ujjain, described in the *Raghuvamśa*, and the description of the erotic life of the citizens of that place, described in the *Meghadūta*, show that Kālidāsa was describing the later Gupta period, in which he was also living. The name given by him to his poem — *Kumārasambhava* — which is another name of Skanda, shows his longing for the re-appearance of an *avatāra* of the type of Skandagupta. This also fits in with the identification of Vikramāditya with Skandagupta.

It was not the custom in India to write systematic accounts of the life of persons, social customs and habits of society were described in the so-called legal treatise and what, in modern times, is known as light literature, respectively. Epics, which proposed to record history, such as *Raghuvamśa*, amplified natural beauty and picturesque things and events and personal details, as those of the body, such as bodily powers and beauty of the body. What are now called historical facts were only hinted.

If Kālidāsa lived after Skandagupta, Bhāsa certainly lived some centuries before Kālidāsa and perhaps Skandagupta also. It has already been shown that he portraits in one of his dramas, an event which even according to European scholars took place in the 5th Century B. C. (8). But the internal evidence in his dramas shows that he lived not long afterwards. As the customs prevalent in Hindu Society change so slowly, what he describes may be taken to be a

picture of the period of Vikramāditya of Ujjain. There is a rival claimant to this title who is alleged to have lived about 500 A. D. and who is said to have founded the era in his name curiously dating back five centuries before. Evidence for this is yet to come and in any case there is no evidence of one of the name having flourished apparently in isolation and as a comet, at Ujjain in that period.

Among the thirteen or fourteen dramas of Bhāsa that have been discovered so far the following refer to events in or about Ujjain. They are —

(1) *Avimdraka* (2) *Pratyāgyagandharīyaga* (3) *Śaṅkavācāratī* and (4) *Chrudatta*. Bhāsa seems to have been a native of Ujjain because his description of the life in the city tallies with what Kālidāsa has written. Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvamśa* and *Meghadūta* refers to Mahākālā a number of gardens, skyscrapers, public women and gay people. In Bhāsa's dramas these are to be found.

The Hero of *Avimdraka* is the heir apparent of Sauvira Kingdom. When he enters the Palace at Vairantya of Kuntibhoja he bows to Mahākālā (Act 3) महिरन्तु महाकाला where this capital is described in details. As this drama has in its story the mixture of the supernatural or superhuman he hides the name of Ujjayini under the name of Vairantya. But the description is of a great capital city (Acts I, III & IV). It appears to relate to the period previous to when Pradyota Capdamahāsena, the contemporary of Udayana Vatsarāja who is the hero of *Pratyāgyagandharīyaga* and *Vācāratī* lived.

In the IV Act of *Avimdraka* is described the Assembly Hall in the Palace. Then is described a public garden. In the 3rd Act the Palace is referred to in reference to its high stories. In the 3rd Act reference is also made to the big lamps of the city which gave a bright light, as that of the moon. This reminds one of the reference in *Raghuvamśa* that the moon on the fore-head of Mahākālā gave the King who lived near by the pleasure of spending all the nights

of the month in the moon light. In Acts 3 & 4, one of which has the soliloquy of Avimāraka, the gay life of the people is delineated. The moral depravity of the Princess, who co-habited with Avimāraka, before the formal ceremony of marriage, in a clandestine manner, and the looseness of her companions or servants, reminds one of the public women described by Kālidāsa. The Palace is said to have been surrounded by a garden and its description is reminiscent of the mansion of Cārudatta. It appears from the drama of the same name that the kingdom of Magadha was declining and people from that country were migrating to the more prosperous Ujjayinī. Among them is *gātrasevaka*, who had come as a refugee from Magadha, mentioned in *Pratiññāyugandharāyana*. So also Sañjivaka, in the 1st Act of *Cārudatta*, became a thief and then rose to be the Commander-in-Chief of the Army.

From the 2nd Act of *Pratiññāyugandharāyana* it appears that the floor of the Chambers of the Palaces were studded with precious stones. Act 4 refers to a swimming pool. The reference to a swimming pool in the public garden in *Avimāraka* should be remembered in this connection. The garden appears to have been on the banks of the Śiprā river. From the 2nd Act of *Pratiññāyugandharāyana* it appears that there were several palaces in the grounds of the main palaces, one of which had its floor of precious stones. As seen from *Avimāraka* it was a separate mansion. The heroine of *Svapnāvāsavadatta* was the Princess of Magadha, from which country came Sanjalaka in *Cārudatta* and *gātrasevaka* in *Pratiññāyugandharāyana*. The marriage with the Princess whose name was Padmāvatī, was brought about in order to enable Udayana to conquer Vatsa country and add it to his Kauśāmbī kingdom.

In his *Pratiññāyugandharāyana*, Bhāsa describes the capture of Udayana, the king of Kauśāmbī and his subsequent running away with the daughter of Candā Mahāsena, his captor, the powerful king of Ujjayinī. Kālidāsa too refers to this event in his *Meghadūta* as being embodied in the

folk lore. Hence this must have been an ancient story or else Kālidāsa would have referred to Bhāsa's drama based on it. His source and that of Kālidāsa seems to be the same viz. the folk lore (सौख्यवा).

Bhāsa's *Scapharidatadatta* records and shows that although Udayana was a descendant of Pāṇḍava's his kingdom of Kauśambi had become moribund. The house of Pradyota at Ujjain had become strong. The kingdom of Magadha so powerful in the time of Jarāsandha of the Pāṇḍava's time had declined. All these events took place long before the rise of the Guptas in Magadha and the reign of Skandagupta Vikramāditya at Ujjayini. Bhāsa's *Cārudatta* also dramatises the period between the fall of the Pradyotas at Ujjayini and the rise of Vikramāditya. Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakatika* appears to have been based on Bhāsa's *Cārudatta*. So if its latter Acts were available they would confirm the incident in *Mṛcchakatika* showing the overthrow of one governor by a representative of the overlord of Ujjain. This incident according to Prof. Oliver took place in 5th century B. C. (8).

Bhāsa's *Arāmīka* seems to record a story long before the reign of the Pradyota dynasty. It enumerates the following names of countries — सीरूर and काशी (Act I). There is also one मागधिया a reference to that state or country. *Pratijñāyagandhārīya* repeats one or two of them (Stanza 8 Act 2).

अस्मत्संक्षेपे मागधः काशिराजो बह्वः सीरूरौ मैथिलः सुरसेवः।

Mr. Krishnaji Laxman Somso whose literary name was K. rat has, in his monumental introduction in his volume of Marathi translations of all the available dramas of Bhāsa published in 1931 exhaustively dealt with the question of the date of Bhāsa. According to him Pīlaka and Gopīlaka mentioned in *Scapharidatadatta* were the sons of Pradyota Candamabāsa and *Cārudatta* records incidents immediately after the demise of Candamabāsa to judge from Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakatika*. Prof. Oliver would go so far only that *Mṛcchakatika* records incidents of the 5th century B. C. Do

that as it may Bhāsa throws light on Ujjayinī as it was before Vikramāditya or his times

Having regard to the fact, as seen from the history of Dharmaśāstras, although there has been growth and evolution, and Bhāsa's antiquity before the 1st Century B C has been shown in the preceding section, the system of law referred to by him in his works may be taken to be prevalent in the 1st century B C since it is, as a matter of fact, still the basis of Hindu Law In his *Pratimā*, Act V, Bhāsa puts in the mouth of Rāvana that, among others, he was proficient in Manavīya Dharmaśāstra, Brhaspati's Arthaśāstra, Medhātithi's Nyāyaśāstra and Śrāddhasamkalpa of Prācetas In *Pratijñāyugandharāyana*, there is the following (Act II)·

एव नामाह्न्यह्नि गोत्रानुकूलेभ्यो राजकुलेभ्य कन्याप्रदानम्, प्रति इति संप्रेषणा वर्तते ।

Bhāsa has no less than six dramas based on *Mahābhārata* and therefore is post-Bharata It appears that the first Dharmaśāstra that placed restrictions on marriages in the same Gotra, existed in his time

Luckily some of the Dharmaśāstra works mentioned by Bhāsa are still in existence, though it may be in the extended form, but the kernel is there The social customs prevalent in his times are referred to in his *Pratijñāyugandharāyana* and *Cārudatta*, e g Gātrasevaka, Samvāhaka respectively, who in Northern India, at least, are very much in evidence.

Brhaspati's Arthaśāstra, which probably means the same work as the Smṛti of that name, or at any rate its evolution may be found in Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra*, *Mahābhārata*, *Manu-smṛti* which certainly is the same as Manavīya Dharmaśāstra, in its present form, are works which at least throw light on the Judicial Administration of those days Śūdraka's *Mṛchakatika* which probably belongs to the 1st century B C. or its story may be taken to be of the period, or included earlier times, if the last three Acts of it are also discovered to be

based on Bhāṣa's *Cāradatta* which has only four Acts at present. How the description of a criminal trial in the former accords with modern criminal trials is shown by a scholar (8).

The Dharma Kosha Mandal of Wai District Satara has published upto now three volumes in which extracts under different topics of law are given from all the extant works of Dharmasāstra. The topics are as follows. —

(1) पञ्चद्वारस्यापना (२) विवाहपद्धतिर्बन्ध (३) विवाहसंयुक्तम्, (४) दायविभाग (५) वास्तुकर्म (६) समवस्थानवाक्यम् (७) कर्मादानम्, (८) क्षीपविधिकम्, (९) पातकर्मकरकथा (१०) समूहसंस्कारानाम्, (११) विक्रीतानुसन्धः (१२) वृत्तस्थानपातकर्मः (१३) अस्वामिदिकथा (१४) स्वस्वामिसंबन्धः (१५) साहसम्, (१६) वाक्यादप्यम्, (१७) वृत्तपादप्यम्, (१८) वृत्तसमाप्यम्, (१९) प्रकीर्णकानि (क्षीपिणीयमर्पणकम्).

All these cover even the modern Civil and Criminal Law and Evidence.

Reference to the authors mentioned by Bhāṣa will show that they like Manu and Brhaspati have discussed what is meant by Law what are its foundations and what are the principles underlying them. Extracts from these works can easily be given in support of the statement made above but it is hardly necessary to do so at this stage. If the main thesis the identification of Vikramāditya with Skandagupta is accepted then it may be appropriate to deal with this topic at length.

Dr B C Chopra, Ootacamund has contributed a paper to the 12th Session of the All India Oriental Conference held at Benares in January 1944. In it he describes an inscription of the time of Skandagupta on a stone pillar found in Rewa somewhere in a jungle. According to the summary which is at present available the inscription is dated the 141st year of the Gupta era. If this era commenced in 57 B C (9) then the belief of the Europeans that the Gupta dynasty reigned from 313-470 A D (13) does not hold water. But if the

Gupta era commenced in 319, then this inscription may belong to Skandagupta I. But taking the commencement of the Gupta era to be in 57 B C by Skandagupta, this ruler of that name must be held to belong to the later Guptas. Anyhow the inscription in Rewa jungles extends far outside Oudh, to which the rule of the Guptas is said to be confined (13)

REFERENCE

- (1) Prof Macdonell's History of Sanskrit Literature, page 375
- (2) Parishistank of Kishora, May 1943, Patna, p 51 (in Hindi)
- (3) A forth-coming paper on "A Gupta Coin", by Mr Diskalkar, M A, Curator of the Indore Museum
- (4) Mr Sathe's "Certain Vedic Avastan and Greek Traditions and the Age of Rīgveda" — A B O R I. Jubilee No pp 451-464
- (5) Mr Mankad's "Manvantara Chaturyuga Method" (ibid pp 271-290)
- (6) Dr Trivedi's "Sheet Anchor of Indian History" ibid pp 591-592
- (7) Dr K P Jaiswal's "Imperial History of India", pp-155-156
- (8) "The Trial of Charudutta in Modern Setting", by Lt -Col T J Kedar, Vice-Chancellor, Nagpur University
- (9) "The Genealogy and Chronology of the Early Imperial Guptas" by Dhirendra Nath Mukarji, Dowlatpur (Transactions of the Indian History Congress, Fifth (Hydarabad) Session 1941, p 177)
- (10) Vikramaditya by Hemachandra Joshi, D Lit (Berlin) (in Hindi)

- (11) Joglekar's Home of the Satavahanas — A B O R I Jubilee Number pp 196-205
- (12) Vikram Samvat In *Satyadris* (Marathi) October 1943 by Dr Altekar
- (13) Historian's History of the World Vol II
- (14) The Dates of Skanda Gupta and his Successors by Mr Pannalal, i c s (The Hindustan Review January 1918).

ANANDAVARDHANA'S TREATMENT OF DOSA

BY PROF. K. KRISHNAMOORTHY

Ānandavardhana's view of *Doṣa* is quite a novel one in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. The earlier writers' had carefully tabulated the various faults that might occur in the usage of words, sentences, and the senses conveyed in poetry. They had given a list of logical, grammatical, syntactical and metrical flaws which might be inadvertently committed in compositions. The metaphysical question whether *Dosas* were positive entities marring the beauty of poetry or merely negative ones resulting in the absence of *Gunas* was also hotly discussed. But Ānandavardhana no longer considers them as absolute entities or attributes like the *Gunas*. He speaks of *Dosas* too only in relation to *Rasa*. According to him, *Aucitya* or propriety is to be regarded as the most fundamental principle governing the incorporation of *Rasa* into literature. The gravest defect in poetry is thus none other than *Rasa-bhaṅga* or hindrance to the even progress of *Rasa*, which, in its turn is a direct result of *anaucitya* or impropriety². In what follows, Ānandavardhana's original observations on *Dosa* are summarised.

'Strict conformance to the canons of propriety (*aucitya*) may be observed in the works of all truly great writers. The most essential function of every *Mahākavi* is to conform to the principles of propriety in selecting his theme and giving adequate expression to it, always keeping *Rasa* in view as the primary goal to be achieved³. In other words the poet should

1 For a fuller treatment of this subject *Vide* my article — 'The Doctrine of *Doṣas* in Sanskrit Poetics', I. H. Q. Vol. XX

2. Cf. 'अनाचित्याद्वेते नान्यद्रसमङ्गस्य कारणम् ।' — Dhv. P. 330 (the abbreviated form Dhv. is used for the *Dhvanyāloka*. Page references are to the Benares Edn. published with the *Līlānā* and the *Bāla-prīyā*.)

3 वाच्याना वाचकाना च यदैचित्थेन योजनम् ।

रसादिविषयेनेतत्कर्म मुख्यं महारुचे ॥ — Dhv. III 32

always be on his guard to steer clear of the deterrents of *Rasa* — no matter whether he is engaged in the composition of a long poem or a short self-contained stanza (*Akṣataka*) — provided he wants to infuse *Rasa* into his work

The deterrents (*Virodhakāraṇa*) of *Rasa* invariably land a poet in *anacitya*, which as mentioned above is the greatest flaw (*Dopa*) that a poet may ever commit. They can be brought under the following heads —

1 Adoption of *Vibhaktas* etc. associated with an incompatible *Rasa*.* For instance if after portraying a person as spiritually minded (i.e. as a *Vibhaktas* of *Sānta-rasa*), the poet makes the same person appear in the rôle of a romantic lover abruptly we have *anacitya*. Similarly when a woman is feigning anger (*Kopa* which is a *Bhāva*) after a love-quarrel (*Pranaya-kalaka*), if the hero is described as wooing her by glowing eloquent over the emptiness of worldly sensual pleasures *anacitya* is the result. And again supposing the lady does not yield to his importunities if the hero is described as getting wild with rage and the *anubhaktas* of *Raudra-rasa* are brought out we have *anacitya*.

2 Distension or indulging in disproportionately lengthy descriptions of things though they might be in some way connected with the *Rasa*† — For instance, while seeking to describe the hero if a poet flies off at a tangent to describe mountains etc. at an inordinate length he will be committing the flaw of *anacitya*.

3 Abrupt break in the delineation of a *Rasa* as also abrupt intrusion of some other *Rasa* :—‡ For example after portraying the rise of mutual love in the hero and the heroine

4 मयमे मुच्यते वापि रसादीन् वस्तुनिष्कृता ।

वस्य कार्यं क्षुमतिता परिहारे विरोधिनाम् ॥ — Dhv. III. 17

5 विरोधिरसम्बन्धिभिर्वावादिपरिहृतः । — Dh. III. 18.

6 विस्तरेवाविरतत्वापि वस्तुनोऽप्यस्य वर्णनम् । — Dhv. III. 18b.

7 अकान्त एव विवक्षितरसमेव न प्रकाशयम् । — Dhv. III. 19a.

if instead of describing their endeavours at union, the poet proceeds to dwell upon their other activities, *anaucitya* will result. In the same way, if a hero like Rāma is shown to suffer the pangs of separation from his lady-love when a terrible battle is raging at its height, there is *anaucitya*⁸. The poet cannot escape this flaw by the excuse that the character is shown to act as a puppet in the hands of destiny, for the theme is not an end in itself for the poet, it is only a means which can be changed at will to be in harmony with the end, viz, throwing *Rasa* into bold relief⁹.

4 Frequent over-elaboration of a *Rasa* even when it has been adequately manifested¹⁰.— Too much of a good thing also becomes bad and by over elaboration the delicate flower-like *Rasa* gets faded.

5 Lastly, impropriety in the portrayal of *Vṛtti* — By *Vṛtti* is meant, the behaviour of the characters, the *Vṛttis* (*Kaiśikī* etc.) of Bharata, and the *Vṛttis* (*Upanāgarikā* etc.) of the rhetoricians¹¹.

The beauty and harmony of *Rasa* are thus marred by *anaucitya* or impropriety and it is the gravest flaw in the poet. Emptied of *Rasa*, a composition is worse than useless and *Nīrasatva* may be regarded as the most unpardonable error in the poet. It will take away from him even the justification for styling himself a poet. Nothing but oblivion is in store for such a work¹². It is true that ancient poets were able to achieve poetic fame though they set at naught of rules.

8 of *Venīsaṃhāra*, II Act

9 न चैवविधे विषये दैवव्यामोहितत्वं कथापुरुषस्य परिहारः, यतो रसबन्ध एव कवे प्राधान्येन स्वप्रवृत्तिनिबन्धनं युक्तम् । इतिवृत्तवर्णनं तु तदुपाय एव ।
Dhv III 363

10 परिपोष गतस्यापि पौन पुन्येन दीपनम् ।

रसस्य स्याद्विरोधाय वृत्त्यनौचित्यमेव च ॥ Dhv III 19 b-c

11 cf Udbhaṭa's *Kāvyaśāstrakārasaṅgraha* I 1 ff

12 नीरसस्तु प्रबन्धो यः सोऽपशब्दो महान्कवे ।

स तेनाकविरेव स्यादन्येनास्मृतलक्षणः ॥ — Dhv p 364

But the moderns should not belittle the truth of the above considerations following their example¹² As a matter of fact the above dicta are in complete conformity with the practice of master-poets like Vālmīki and Vyāsa¹³

In this connection Anandavardhana points out how the flaw of *anaucciya* can be avoided in different ways There can be no dogmatic rule about *anuciya* and *anaucciya* which will have universal application Each individual instance of poetry will have to be judged on its own merits Some *Rasas* are mutually opposed; e.g. *Śṛṅgāra* and *Bīṭhatis Vīra* and *Bhayaṅkara Śānta* and *Raudra* and *Śānta* and *Śṛṅgāra*¹⁴ But they can be delineated simultaneously by the poet if the primary *Rasa* has been already well brought out and established on a secure footing The principal *Rasa* should be competent enough to outline the opposite *Rasa* that is all Or the opposite *Rasa* might be made an ancillary of the principal one In either case no *anaucciya* is committed¹⁵

Hence it follows that in every work of literature there must be only one dominant *Rasa* though the other *Rasas* also can enter into relation with it as ancillaries.¹⁶ The occurrence of the other *Rasas* can in no way detract from the importance of the principal one since the latter is seen steadily and constantly running through the entire work and is never totally lost sight of¹⁷ The unity of *Rasa* is analogous to the unity

12 पूर्वे वि द्युतविराजन्तः शब्दाः प्रागुदीर्यते ।

तान्ममाधित्वं न स्वात्मा नीतिरसो मनीषिणा — Dh. P. 34

13 बाष्पीक्षिणासमुत्थाय ये दम्बानां वशीयन् ।

तदभिप्रायवादीसर्वे नास्मानिर्दिष्टिना नयः न — Dhv. P. 363

15 Dhv. P. 384.

16 विवर्तिन रसे लक्ष्यवर्तिने नु निरोधिताम् ।

बाष्पाजामुभावे वा मासजामुल्लिख्यता न — Dh. III. 29

17 प्रतिदेर्मा प्रकाशवती नानावर्णिकवर्णे ।

एवै रत्नोद्गीकृतम्वापामुदयमिच्छता न — Dhv. III. 31

18 एतन्मन्त्रमावृताः प्रकाशयन्त्यस्य न ।

नामन्त्राणि लोभयन्तीति चेन्नानुचितम् — Dhv. III. 32

of action in a drama, where, in spite of the variety and complexity of the incidents, the organic wholeness of the theme is preserved. The diversity of ancillary *Rasas* only serves to enhance the beauty of the principal one ¹⁹

As a corollary, it follows that no other *Rasa* (opposed or unopposed), should receive greater treatment in a work than the principal one. Attention should be primarily devoted towards the principal *Rasa* and the others should come in only incidentally. By so doing the opposition between *Rasas* will soon disappear ²⁰

Further, an opposite *Rasa* may be pressed into service of the principal one by showing it to occur in a different character. For instance, if *Vīra* is being described in the hero, its opposite, viz., *Bhayānaka* may be delineated with references to the anti-hero and by so doing the effect of the principal *Rasa* is reinforced by striking contrast. Even elaboration of it at great length will cease to be a flaw then ²¹

It is also possible that sometimes two *Rasas*, mutually opposed, may be shown in one and the same character. In such instances the two *Rasas* should not be portrayed simultaneously, otherwise there would be *anaucitya dosa*. Some other *Rasa* should be made to intervene the two *Rasas*, and the fault is thus avoided ²². Nor is there anything surprising about this. For even in small self-contained stanzas (which are so very small in compass when compared with long

19 कार्यमेक यथा व्यापि प्रबन्धस्य विधीयते ।

तथा रसस्यापि विधी विरोधो नैव विद्यते ॥ — Dhv I II 23

20 अविरोधो विरोधो वा रसोक्तिनि रसान्तरे ।

परिपोष न नेतव्यस्तथा स्यादविरोधिता ॥ — Dhv III 24

21 विशदैकाग्रयो यस्तु विरोधी स्यायिनो भवेत् ।

स विभिन्नाश्रय कार्यस्तस्य पोषेऽप्यदोषता ॥ — Dhv III 25

22 एकाश्रयत्वे निर्दोषो नैरन्तर्ये विरोधवान् ।

रसान्तरव्यवधिना रसो न्यस्य सुमेघसा ॥ — Dhv III 26

cf the intrusion of *Adbhuta* between *Sṛṅgāra* and *Sānta* in the *Nāgānanda* — Dhv III 26

poems) consisting of not more than a single sentence this phenomenon is observed. The mutual enmity of two *Rasas* is seen to disappear when a third *Rasa* intervenes between them ²³

Opposition and agreement between *Rasas* must be clearly noted as indicated above and particularly when dealing with *Śṛṅgāra-Rasa* as it is the most delicate of all the *Rasas*. The slightest inappropriateness will spoil it completely. And what is more the flaw of the poet becomes most patent there. The poet should therefore take special care while portraying *Śṛṅgāra* ²⁴

Since *Śṛṅgāra* thus occupies the greatest place amongst the *Rasas* more often than not, the poet will have to incorporate it into his work. He may have to infuse a tinge of *Śṛṅgāra* even into themes not strictly amenable to such treatment. But it will not be a fault provided the poet deliberately resorts to such *Śṛṅgāric* elaboration with a definite purpose in view. The purpose may be either to win over the audience before giving them moral instruction or to invest his composition with greater beauty ²⁵

Such is the nature of *śūdrōkha* and *śrōtrōkha* amongst *Rasas*. And by grasping the above distinctions carefully the poet will be in a position to steer clear of all blemishes. He will never stray away into the mire of *doṣas* ²⁶

23 रसाभ्यन्तरित्तोरेकवाक्यस्त्वयोरपि ।
विचर्तन्ते हि रसयोः समावेशे विरोधिता ॥ — Dhv III, 27

24 विरोधमविरोधं च सर्वत्रार्थ निरूपयेत् ।
विरोधस्तु भृशं च घृण्यमाहरो हसौ ॥
अथवा नातिप्रसक्त्ये तत्रैव सत्कथि ।
मनेत्तस्मिन्ममाहो हि शक्तिमयोपलब्धौ ॥ — Dh III, 28-9

25 विनेयानुमुदीक्यु काव्यसोमार्थमैव वा ।
तद्विररघदगर्हस्तद्वानां न दुष्पति ॥ — Dhv III, 30

26 विज्ञायेत्वं रसादीनामविरोधविरोधयोः ।
विषयं सुकथिः काव्यं दुर्बलं सुसति च वक्ति ॥ — Dh III, 31

The ancient writer Bhāmaha,²⁷ and following him Dandin²⁸, had advanced the view that a blemish is not always a blemish. Bhāmaha went to the extent of maintaining that a blemish may sometimes be converted into an excellence. Ānandavardhana's contention is that this fact of impermanence of *Doṣas*, recognised even by the earlier writers, would fit in with his scheme of poetry better than with the earlier one. By following the earlier view, we would be left without a positive criterion to help us in judging whether a blemish hinders or helps the poetic effect in a given instance. But if the principle of *Rasa-Dhvanī* is accepted, there would be no longer any such difficulty. "*Dhvanī* is the soul of poetry, *Rasa* is the soul of *Dhvanī*, and *Śṛṅgāra* is the most important of all the *Rasas*." On the basis of this truth, we can arrive at a positive criterion for judging blemishes or *Doṣas*. *Doṣas* like *Śrūtiduṣṭa* (lit. offending the ear)²⁹ may be looked upon as blemishes only when they creep into compositions treating of *Śṛṅgārarasa* as the most primarily suggested emotion. In other places they cease to be faults.³⁰

Finally, Ānandavardhana attempts to offer a useful classification of *Doṣa*. He avoids going into minor details and broadly classifies all *doṣas* under two heads — *avyutpattikṛta* and *aśaktikṛta*. *Vyutpatti* is the training and education which a poet has received, and *Śakti* the gift of poetic genius which he inherits. A blemish may be committed either for want of proper education (*avyutpatti*) or for want of poetic imagina-

27 cf सशिवेशविशेषात्तु दुष्कमपि शोभते ।

नील पलाशमावद्धमन्तराले रजामिव ॥

किञ्चिदाश्रयसौन्दर्याद् घटे शोभामसाध्वपि ।

कान्ताविलोचनन्यस्त मलीमसमिवाञ्जनम् ॥ — Kāvya-lankāra, I 54-5

28 cf न लिङ्गवचने भिन्ने न हीनाधिकतापि वा ।

उपमादूषणायाल यत्रोद्देशो न वीमताम् ॥ — Kāvya-darśa, II 51

29 cf Bhāmaha's Kāvya-lankāra, I 47

30 श्रुतिदुष्टादयो दोषा अनित्या ये च दर्शिता ।

ध्वन्यात्मन्येव शृङ्गारे ते हेया इत्युदाहृता ॥ — Dhv II 11

tion (*asakti*). Of these the former class of *dopas* will not look glaring in case there is sufficient poetic imagination to cover them. But the latter class will strike one even at the first glance.³¹ By this Ānandavardhana indirectly shows the intrinsic relation between *Rasa* and *Sakti* or *Pratibhā*—a subject for the consideration of which he devotes a whole chapter later on.³²

It is indeed a great compliment to the taste of Ānandavardhana that he refrains from illustrating the blemishes at great length like his predecessors in the field. He feels that captious discovery of blemishes in great poets on the part of the critic will be nothing but a sad commentary on his own lack of culture. He says: Even in the works of masters blemishes are bound to creep in; but they need not be catalogued overshadowed as they are by a thousand and one excellences.³³

31 अक्षुप्ततिष्ठो दोषा स्वस्वा संनिवृत्ते कवेः ।

यत्प्रयच्छिष्यस्तस्य स तद्विद्वत्प्रसादते ॥ — Dhv P 316

32 *The Fourth Uddyota*.

33 तस्य सूक्ष्मदृष्टिदोषितात्मना दोषोदोषप्रमात्मन एव दृष्टं भवतीति न विमज्ज वदितम् । — Dhv P 223

SLAVERY AS KNOWN TO EARLY BUDDHISTS

BY DR B C LAW

Slavery is a very old institution. It existed, even in its worst form, in Egypt, Sumeria, Chaldea, Babylonia, Assyria, Phoenicia, Greece and Rome, China and Persia. It existed in different forms and degrees when Megasthenes visited India as a Greek ambassador. A regular trade in slaves was carried on in all these countries. It is rightly observed "Slavery and idolatry of various kinds and forms darkened the social and religious life of the ancient peoples, and they were the two dreaded evils against which the human soul cried for relief, release, and emancipation."

If Megasthenes had paid the highest compliment to India on the ground that no person was held as a slave and all were treated as free, even the foreigners not being used as slaves, it was, as Rhys Davids sought to explain, for the reason that the kind and form of slavery which existed then in India was nothing when compared with the Greek or the Roman form¹. But the better explanation seems to be that the Greek ambassador distinguished simply between *de jure* and *de facto* slaves. In India of his time all men were held equal and all Indians passed as free citizens in the eye of law. He did not omit to mention that both the philosophic view and the law of the land combined to see all men free in India, allowing property to be unevenly distributed². In corroboration of the above testimony of Megasthenes one may cite the bold pronouncement in the *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, that servitude shall not be the condition of an Aryan, although it may be proper for the *Mlecchas* to sell or hold children to slavery³. Accordingly it

1 *Buddhist India*, p. 55

2 McCrindle, *Ancient India*, pp. 38 and 211

3 *Arthaśāstra*—(Revised & edited by R. Shama Sastri), 1919, p. 181—*Mlecchānām adoṣaḥ prajāṃ vikretumādhātum vā. Na tvevāryasya dāsabhāvaḥ.*

prescribes the following laws to safeguard the position of slaves and to merit the admission of all right thinking men

Employing a slave to carry the dead or to sweep urine or the leavings of food etc. keeping a slave naked or hurting or abusing him or violating the chastity of a female slave shall cause the forfeiture of the value paid for him or her. When a man commits or helps another to commit rape with a female slave he shall not only forfeit the purchase value but also pay a certain amount of money to her and a fine of twice the amount to the government. The ransom necessary for a slave to regain his freedom is equal to what he has been sold for. Failure to set a slave at liberty on the receipt of a required amount of ransom shall be punished. If a pregnant female slave is sold or pledged without any provision for her confinement her master shall be punished as well as the abettor. Selling or mortgaging the life of a slave once liberated shall be punished with fine.

The statement in the *Arthashastra* regarding the slave trade among the *Aleccakas* has its strong support in an incidental statement of the Buddha purporting to say that the Yonas, Kāmbhojas, Gāndhāras and other peoples of the Frontier countries admitted just two social grades of masters and slaves (*ayya dāsa*) without meaning an impassable social barrier between the two: *ayyo hutvā dāso hoti, dāso hutvā ayyo hoti*⁴. They are typically the peoples of the Uttarāpatha or North-Western India who are described in the *Mahābhārata* XII 207-43 as terrible *Aleccaka* tribes

Uttarāpatha-janādīnāṃ Mrtayasyāmi tān apī |
Yonau-Kāmbhoja-Gāndhārāḥ Kīrāta-Barbarāḥ saha. ||

They are again the peoples whom the Pāli scholiast Buddhaghosa characterises as Persianised in their social organisation (*Pārasaka-vappā*).

The *Vidhuraṇṇa Jātaka* speaks of the four kinds of

4 *Majjhima Nikāya*, II, p. 149

5 *P. pārasikānāṃ* III, p. 410 *Pārasika-vappā*, (variant).

slaves (1) those born of slave parents or begotten on slave women (*antojātā*),⁶ (2) those purchased with money (*dhana kkitā*), (3) those reduced to slavery under coercion by bandits (*karamarānītā*), and (4) those who took to slavery of their own accord (*samamdāsavyamupagatā*)

Slavery might be incurred through capture⁷ or commuted death sentence or debt⁸ or voluntary self-degradation⁹ or judicial punishment¹⁰

The *Manusamhitā* (VIII 415) distinguishes seven kinds of slaves (1) those who are captured during the war, (2) those who serve in return for maintenance, (3) those who are born in the house, (4) those who are bought, (5) those who are received as gifts, (6) those who are inherited from the father, and (7) those who are made slaves by court sentence

The *Arthaśāstra* list is made up of at least ten kinds of slaves, while Nārada's law book recognizes a still larger number. Thus the number of classes increased in time, and slavery assumed a feudal character since, perhaps, it received a legal sanction from the Brahmin Law-givers headed by Manu¹¹

The individuals, captured in predatory raids were reduced to slavery¹². They became slaves of their own accord¹³. Children born to slaves were also slaves. In the majority of cases we find that the slaves were employed as household servants. They were also employed to cultivate lands. In the house of a pious Brāhmana named Dhammapāla even the slaves and labourers gave alms and observed the precepts and fasts¹⁴. The slaves were regarded as the property of the master¹⁵. The *Sonanda Jātaka*¹⁶ speaks of manumitted slaves

6 *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, I, p. 300, *Jāt* no 545

7 *Jātaka*, IV, 220 8 *Ibid*, VI, 521

9 *Vinaya*, I 72, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, I, 168 10 *Jātaka*, I, 200.

11 *Manu*, VIII, 413

12 "Sūdraṃ tu kārāyad dāsyam kṛtam akṛtam eva vā |
dāsyāyauva hi sṛṣṭo 'sau Brāhmaṇasya svayambhuvā ||"

13 *Jātaka*, IV, 220

14 *Vinaya Texts*, I, 191

15 *Jātaka*, IV, 50

16 *Visayha Jātaka*, *Jātaka* IV, 262

The Jatakas contain instances where the slaves were bought for 700 *kakāpāyas* ¹⁷ Traffic in human beings (*sattha-vapijja manussavikkaya*) ¹⁸ implied slave trade According to the *Milinda* rooms in a well laid city or town had to be made for the residence of the various classes of people including slaves and slave girls ¹⁹

The Pali word *Apaddana* refers to household servants (*peśikā*) ²⁰ The slaves (*Dāsa-kammakaras*) laboured for others in return of some payment (*bhataka*) whether in kind or in money ²¹ The profession of a slave was hereditary The agriculture labourers received the customary wages The day labourers returned to their own houses in the evening ²² The slave or servant was an adjunct in all households capable of rendering domestic service The male and female slaves were domestic servants who resided in the houses of their masters and performed all household duties. ²³ Children born of slave parents generally took to the same profession ²⁴ There was a home-born slave by the name of *Brahi*. ²⁵ The captives or prisoners of war could be enslaved A beautiful maiden whenever caught as a prisoner of war was used as a slave ²⁶ (*dāsihogena bhavijjanti*). Slaves specially female were given away as gifts ²⁷ (*dānaya*). A village superintendent was made a slave of the village because he slandered the villagers before the king ²⁸ Ministers condemned to death by the king for jealousy were given away as slaves ²⁹ (*dāsa katoṇa dāsi*). Attendants and menials belonged to the category of slaves ³⁰ A master had an absolute right over his slave ³¹ A female slave was considered as

16. *Jātaka* no 532. 17 *Jātaka*, III 343 18. *Anguttara Nidāya*, II 208.

19. *Milinda*, p 331 20. *Apaddana*, II, 357 f II.

21. *Jātaka* II 139; III pp 129 237 326 & 444; V 212, 293; VI, 365.

Cf. Anāpāka Sutta, I 2, 3, 1. 22. *Jātaka*, III, 443.

23. *Ibid* I pp 200, 225 158

24. *Ibid.*, I pp 225, 431; III pp 409 444 25. *Ibid* VI, p 117.

26. *Ibid.*, IV p. 220. 27. *Ibid.*, VI, pp 442, 464 503, etc.

28. *Ibid.*, I, pp 200 341 29. *Ibid* VI p 389.

30. *Ibid.*, IV pp. 320 342

31. *Ibid.*, VI p. 300; *Parasut of the Brothers*, p. 360; *Ibid.*, p 22.

one of the members of the household³² A master was courteous enough to accept the words of his slave with due honour³³ Slaves were permitted to learn reading and writing and handicrafts along with the sons of their masters³⁴ Sometimes they were appointed as store-keepers or guards of property³⁵ In some instances the suffering and happiness of the slaves were linked up with those of their masters³⁶ For the slightest fault a slave was beaten, imprisoned and branded³⁷ A female slave was thrown down at the door of the house and beaten with rope-ends by her master because she could not bring home her wages³⁸ The slaves could be rightfully given away to another³⁹ Some runaway slaves were seeking opportunity to free themselves from the clutches of their masters⁴⁰ Slaves could regain freedom on payment⁴¹ or through voluntary manumission by their masters⁴² A slave was ordinarily engaged in cooking,⁴³ fetching water,⁴⁴ pounding and drying rice,⁴⁵ carrying food and watching the field,⁴⁶ giving alms,⁴⁷ handing plates and dishes, bringing spittoon and fetching fans during meals,⁴⁸ and sweeping the yards and stables⁴⁹ Slavery was so common that not only the kings and wealthy people but also the Brahmins and recluses and villagers and farmers kept slaves in their custody⁵⁰

Slaves (*dāsā*) were drawn from all classes under various circumstances Their lot was miserable and their status low But, in spite of all that, they occupied a position in society They could not be regarded as impure because they had to work for their masters in manifold household duties like helping their masters in dressing and undressing,

32 *Ibid*, III, p 162, II, p 428 33 *Ibid*, V, pp 485-86

34 *Ibid*, I, p 451 35 *Ibid*, I, p 225 36 *Ibid*, VI, p 285

37 *Ibid*, I, p 451 38 *Ibid*, I, p 402

39 *Ibid*, VI, pp 285, 575 40 *Ibid*, I, pp 452, 458

41 *Ibid*, VI, p 547 42 *Jātaka* V, p 313 43 *Ibid*, V 105

44 *Ibid*, V 284, 413 45 *Ibid*, I, 484 46 *Ibid*, III, 163

47 *Ibid* IV, 67 48 *Ibid*, I, 453 49 *Ibid*, VI, 138

50 *Ibid*, II, 428. III, 101, V, 105, VI, 117

awaiting in the care of their bodies preparing and serving the food and cleansing the house. They were not counted as a caste.

Female slaves could be emancipated only with the consent of their masters. The position of a female slave was rather pitiful. A slave woman like a Roman slave girl was the property of her master who had every control over her. She was generally ill treated. A painful instance of ill treatment is found in the *Majjhima Nikāya*. A woman named Kili was the maid servant of a house-holder's wife living at Śrāvastī. She was skilful and capable of doing her duties well. Kili in order to test whether the fame of her mistress as a gentle and considerate lady was due to her or not once rose late in the morning. Her mistress showed her dissatisfaction at this. On the second day she rose up late and was rebuked. On third day she rose up still very late and was so severely beaten by her mistress that her head was broken.⁵¹

In addition to other household duties a slave-woman husked paddy⁵² pounded rice⁵³ and went to market.⁵⁴

A slave-woman could obtain freedom if she could prove herself worthy of it. A daughter of Anāthapindika's slave was given freedom when she defeated a Brahmin in argument and proved herself to be a woman of religious disposition.⁵⁵

The consent of the master was necessary for the marriage of his female slaves. Pasenadi king of Kosala had to secure the consent of the master before he could marry Mallikā, the daughter of a slave woman.

Men-servants being of low birth were naturally uncultured and of low spirits. Some of them were in the habit of stealing coins or articles. But the influence of the Buddha's *dharma* had a splendid effect on their character.⁵⁶

It is not a fact that the Buddha had not exerted himself

51 *Majjhima Nikāya*, I, pp. 125 ff.; *Cf. Vinayavastu Commentary* pp. 20, ff.

52 *Dhammapadam Commentary* I 321. 53 *Jāṇaka*, No. 43.

54 *Dhammapadam Commentary* I 208. 55 *Therīgāthā Commentary* pp. 199 ff.

56 *Dhammapadam Commentary* I, 206 ff.; *Mahāvastu*, 214. *Vinayavastu Commentary* 45-47. 91-92.

in the interest of the slaves and servants. The fact that bondage and indebtedness were held as positive disqualifications for admission into the Buddhist religious order and fraternity,⁵⁷ is not to be pressed as an argument. The slaves and debtors were excluded because the Buddha wanted to see Brotherhood founded by him as an association of free men. Among the philosophers and religious teachers who pleaded for the cause of equality and liberty, the Buddha ranked foremost, if he was not the pioneer of the movement. He described servitude (*dāsavyam*) as a most painful state of woe along with debt (*inaṃ*), imprisonment (*bandhanāgāram* — lit prison), illness (*rogam*), and journey through a wilderness (*kantāvaddhānamaggaṃ*)⁵⁸ He completely refrained from accepting male and female slaves (*Dāsī-dāsā-patiggaḥanā pativirato*)⁵⁹ He prohibited traffic in human beings (*sattavanijjā*) or slave-trade on the part of the *upāsakas*⁶⁰ In accordance with a clear *Jātaka* maxim no man should offer himself to slavery. In order to ameliorate the condition of slaves and servants (*dāsa-kammakarā*) the Buddha laid down the five essential duties of a noble householder towards them, namely, "employing them according to their capacity, giving them proper meals and wages, attending them in times of illness, sharing with them delicacies and special dishes, and occasionally granting them leave."⁶¹

It may be said that the religious movement in India prior to Manu was directed to obtain emancipation from all kinds of bondage, physical, moral, intellectual, or spiritual. A change took place along with the Brahmanical reaction against the liberal and progressive thoughts. Slavery, instead of being abolished, came to be regarded as a necessary social institution. The classes of slaves increased in number, and there is no evidence of any attempt being made to improve their position in life.

57 *Vinaya Piṭaka*, I, p. 76—*Na bhikkhave ināyito pabbājetabbo Na bhikkhave dāso pabbājetabbo*

58 *Dīgha Nikāya*, I, p. 73 59 *Ibid*, I, p. 5

60 *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, III, p. 208—*Imā kho bhikkhave pañca vanijjā upāsakena akaranīyāni*

61 *Dīgha Nikāya*, III, p. 191—"Yathābalaṃ kammanta-saṃvādhānena, bhatta-Vettanānuppadānena, gilānupaṭṭhānena, acchariyānaṃ rasānaṃ saṃvādhāgenā samaye vossaggena"

GENESIS OF THE SCIENCE OF MEDICINE IN ANCIENT INDIA

BY SRI GIRIJA PRASANNA MAJUMDAR

Mother (of mankind) hundred are your applications,
a thousandfold is your growth do you who fulfil a
hundred functions make this my (people) free from
disease ' (R V X 97 2)

The connection between the study of plant life and the Science of Medicine has been intimate throughout the whole course of genesis development and the culmination of the latter in India—from the genesis traced in the verses of the Rgveda down to its culmination in the monumental treatises of Caraka and Suśruta.

The application of plants as medicines is recorded in both the Rg and Atharva Vedas. The first medical utterance of man is to be found in the Rgveda in the Anusadhi Sūkta of the Tenth Maṇḍala where one hundred and seven applications of the brown tinted plants are mentioned. But the number must not be taken literally but as a vague statement of plurality.

Two other hymns (VII 18 X 145) are also devoted in invoking plants against poison and a rival wife the latter to make my husband my alone.

We get in these three hymns the names of certain plants with Soma the king of plants at their head and Aśvavatī, Somavatī Udojasa and Urjasyantī and possibly also Aśvattha (*Ficus religiosa*), Palāśa (*Butea frondosa*) and Śālmali (*Bombay malabaricum*) as powerful agencies of cure against disease.

" From him, O Plants I in whom you creep from limb to limb, from joint to joint, you drive away diseases like a mighty (prince), stationed in the midst of his host " 12

" The plants falling from heaven said, ' The man whom living we pervade, will not perish ' " 17

Innumerable applications of plants are referred to though not definitely named. The genesis of the whole body of medicine is given as Divine and the nature of the cure is clearly characterised as radical, permanent and comprehensive, though the details are lacking. Where are the details gone? They are either lost altogether to all intents and purposes, or they existed in popular memory and were handed down by tradition from generation to generation till at last they came to be synoptically recorded in the Vedic Texts quoted above.

Curiously enough we have a harvest of details bearing on the subject of medicinal plants, their utilities, their classifications, the diseases against which they are applied, the association in which they have to be applied and the rest, in the texts of the Atharvaveda. In the Rgvedic hymns medicinal uses of plants together with mention of some plants are given, classification of plants are indicated, and the diseases, supernatural and natural, are referred to as being within the province of perfect and radical cure through the application of plants as drugs. But a more elaborate account is given in the Atharvaveda. There are points of similarity between the two, nay, there is essential identity. The latter seems to be only an elaborate edition, a popular commentary of the former.

For the sake of convenience we classify the medicinal plants and diseases against which they are used, in the Atharvaveda, under the following heads —

- 1 Those that cure physical maladies brought about by purely physical agencies (Kāyacikitsā)

GENESIS OF THE SCIENCE OF MEDICINE IN ANCIENT INDIA

BY SRI GIRIJA PRASAD MAJUMDAR

Mother (of mankind) hundred are your applications,
a thousandfold is your growth do you who fulfil a
hundred functions make this my (people) free from
diseases (R V X 97 2)

The connection between the study of plant life and the Science of Medicine has been intimate throughout the whole course of genesis development and the culmination of the latter in India—from the genesis traced in the verses of the Rgveda down to its culmination in the monumental treatises of Caraka and Susruta.

The application of plants as medicines is recorded in both the Rg and Atharva Vedas. The first medical utterance of man is to be found in the Rgveda in the Anushti Sukta of the Tenth Mandala where one hundred and seven applications of the brown tinted plants are mentioned. But the number must not be taken literally but as a vague statement of plurality.

Two other hymns (VII 18 X 145) are also devoted to invoking plants against poison and a rival wife the latter to make my husband my alone.

We get in these three hymns the names of certain plants with Soma the king of plants at their head and Aśvatthī Somavattī Udojavā and Urjayantī and possibly also Aśvattha (*Ficus religiosa*) Palāśa (*Butea frondosa*) and Śalmali (*Bombay malabaricum*) as powerful agencies of cure against disease.

1 Eng. translations re II from Wilson ed

"From him, O Plants ! in whom you creep from limb to limb, from joint to joint, you drive away diseases like a mighty (prince), stationed in the midst of his host " 12

"The plants falling from heaven said, 'The man whom living we pervade, will not perish ' " 17

Innumerable applications of plants are referred to though not definitely named. The genesis of the whole body of medicine is given as Divine and the nature of the cure is clearly characterised as radical, permanent and comprehensive, though the details are lacking. Where are the details gone ? They are either lost altogether to all intents and purposes, or they existed in popular memory and were handed down by tradition from generation to generation till at last they came to be synoptically recorded in the Vedic Texts quoted above.

Curiously enough we have a harvest of details bearing on the subject of medicinal plants, their utilities, their classifications, the diseases against which they are applied, the association in which they have to be applied and the rest, in the texts of the Atharvaveda. In the Rgvedic hymns medicinal uses of plants together with mention of some plants are given, classification of plants are indicated, and the diseases, supernatural and natural, are referred to as being within the province of perfect and radical cure through the application of plants as drugs. But a more elaborate account is given in the Atharvaveda. There are points of similarity between the two, nay, there is essential identity. The latter seems to be only an elaborate edition, a popular commentary of the former.

For the sake of convenience we classify the medicinal plants and diseases against which they are used, in the Atharvaveda, under the following heads —

- 1 Those that cure physical maladies brought about by purely physical agencies (Kāyachikitsā)

- 2 Those that cure supernatural maladies brought about by supernatural agencies (Bhūtavidyā)
- 3 help in the procreation and protection of children (Kāumārābhya)
- 4 are used for curing and healing up of minor and serious wounds etc (Salya vidyā)
- 5 used against the venom of snakes and other insects (Vipra-vidyā)
- 6 used for securing the prosperity and prolongation of life (Rasāyana)
- 7 used for virility and erotic success (Vijikarapa)
- 8 Miscellaneous uses of plants

Plants against each of the maladies enumerated above are mentioned together with their application. In almost all cases plants as drugs have to be used in association with some incantations or invocations of the Divine. The diseases were never thought to be pure affairs of the body and their cure to be perfect and radical, had to be both bodily and spiritual.

1 *Physical Maladies* The physical maladies against which cure is provided are : obstruction of urine (I 3); white leprosy (I 23-24); abortion (II 25); head disease evil of the eye against fever and other maladies (V 4); against disease *takman* (VII 39) and injury and diseases in general (1-2). The medicinal plants identified with their modern representatives are Reed Haridrī Kuṣṭha Citraparni Māṣaparni Lak man Putrajant Putrakendī and Putradā.

2. *Supernatural Maladies* : As the title indicates remedies of supernatural diseases were exclusively directed against supernatural agencies such as demons yakṣmas ghosts the curses of gods and the like. Plants used as drugs were sometimes applied by themselves and sometimes in association with incantations, invocations and magical formulae.

Remedies prescribed are against curses and cursers (II, 7), against various evils (IV 7), against witchcraft (II 18), possession by evil spirits (37), exorcism (V 15), to discover sorcerers (IV 20), for relief from yakṣma (VI 85), and for some one's restoration to health (VIII 7). All the plants prescribed are not unfortunately named, only a few can be identified with their modern representatives, and they are Durvā, Apāmārga, Aśvattha, Banyan, Ajaśrngī, Avakā, Varana, Sahadevī, Sadampusa, etc.

3 *Plants that help in the procreation and protection of children* It is a matter of unique pride that procreation and preservation of children received consideration of the ancient mind. Side by side with procreation had to be considered the hindrances, natural and supernatural, and consequently the requisite remedies.

The plants used for these purposes are the white and yellow Mustard plants, and they are prescribed against abortion (II 25), for fecundity "to procure the conception of male offspring" (III 23). Book VIII 6, prescribes medicines to guard a pregnant woman from demons.

4 *Plants used for curing wounds* — The hymns are very few in number, but they are enough to show that the first Surgeons of India, for so we must call them, knew a good deal of human Anatomy, displayed a good deal of skill in prescribing remedies according to the nature of wounds. They also appear to be acquainted with a process of classification of plants. The hymns bearing on the subject are IV 12, V 5, VI 109, and the plants prescribed as relieving drugs are Arundhatī, (Śilācī), Plaksa, Khadira, Dhava, Nyagrodha, Parna and Pippalī.

5 *Plants used against venom of snakes and other insects*. Medicines were also provided for the treatment of snake bites, etc. The kind of snakes from which men were in constant apprehension of danger are distinctly mentioned. The germ of snake worship as represented by the modern Vāstu and Manasā Pujā may be traced to one of the verses. One of

the verses again shows that the Vedic physician knew the physiological fact that heart is the centre of all vital activities. The hymns referred to are : \ 13 VII 56 X 4. Plants are : Madhūka Madhuga

6 *For securing prosperity and prolongation of life with plants* — The Vedic physician took into account man not only in a state of disease but also in a state of health. They devoted their attention to find remedies not only to granting security to life but also to the prolongation of life. The most important plants used are Aparāṅgī Parna Palāśa Aśvattha Tālāśa, Pūṣhī, Svadhī, Khadira and Śiṣhepāl.

Prosperity is also sought to be brought about by the defeat of foes. The following hymns illustrate our remarks II 27 III 5 6 VI 15 96 129

7 *Plants used for virility and erotic success* Medicines were also found out and prescribed both for increasing man's virility on the one hand and for impairing the virility of opponents. Very allied to the problem of virility is the problem of amatory success and we find a large number of plants such as, Madhūka Yastumadhu Pūṣhī Vānaparni Kṣipitthaka Arka Candī and Śaṅkhauspikā (hemp). The hymns concerned are I 34 III 18 IV 4, VI 72 107, 138 139 and VII 38

8 *Miscellaneous uses of plants* Items are many

(a) *Utility of plants to promote growth of hair* It is surprising that even in its infancy the medical science (?) in India took note of the importance of cosmetic considerations for the purpose of the improvement of appearance. Hymns VI 30 136 and 137 mention Samī as the plant to be used for contributing to the preservation growth development and nicety of hairs

(b) *Plant amulets for various purposes* Amulet of *Varuṇa* (\ 3) is recommended to be worn for the prevention of injury to body atonement of hereditary sins warding off foes and the attainment of prosperity. Amulet of *Darbha* (\X 28-33) is used for the purpose of the prolongation of

life, for protection, for warding off enemies and for a variety of material blessings. An amulet of *Udumbara* (XIX 21) assures blessings of progeny, material prosperity, protection against enemy, and lordship over men and other animals. The plants *Jangida* (34, 35), *Śatavāra* (36) and *Guggula* (38) are mentioned as remedies against diseases and for protection against witchcraft, and for various other blessings.

LATER DEVELOPMENT

Evidently a long period must have elapsed between rudimentary Science of Medicine gleaned out of Vedic Texts as shown above and scientifically written works of Caraka and Suśruta. Our business is not to discuss the gradual development of the Āyurvedic Science but to remain satisfied with the tracing of its genesis to that fountain head of all Sciences and Arts, namely, the Vedic Texts. From the statements in the Caraka, Suśruta and other Medical treatises it is clear beyond all possibility of doubt, that, there must have existed a treatise or treatises of the name marking the intermediate period of transition between the Vedas on the one hand, and the Caraka and Susruta on the other. Without the hypothesis of the existence of such a work the unbridgeable gulf separating the rudimentary science of medicine gleaned out of the Vedic Texts and the fully developed and scientifically accurate works of Caraks and Suśruta cannot be explained.

In any case Atharvanic origin of the Indian Science of Medicine seems to be warranted by facts. Caraka appears to be decisive on the point (Ca Sam I, Chap XXX, 8, 9) "If anybody enquires from which of the four Vedas, Rg, Sāma, Yajus, and Atharva, Āyurveda, i.e. the Veda of Life emanates? What is Life? Why the treatise is called the Science of Life? Is it transient or permanent? What are the sub-divisions of the Science of Life? To whom is it open for study and why? A physician when thus interrogated, of all the four Vedas, should mention the Āyurveda emphatically as the Veda of Life, i.e. should point out the Āyur-Veda as a part of the Atharva for this reason that the Atharva

has prescribed treatment by gift expiation sacrifice atonement and fast as well as by incantations and has prescribed treatment solely as conducive to the welfare of life etc

It is called the Āyurveda or the Science of Life because it enables us to understand what Āyu or Life is. If asked how it explains life the answer is this — It is called Āyurveda because it brings home to us the nature of Āyu by characterisation by happiness by misery by good and evil and by positive and negative proofs. The Sūtrata coming after the Caraka precisely agrees with it in describing the same genesis of Āyurveda (Sūtra 1 3)

The major divisions of the Science of Medicine as occurring in the two treatises the Caraka and Sūtrata Saṁhitā are as follows —

(Caraka I xxx 15 Sūtrata I 1 3) —

- 1 Śalyatantra (Major Surgery)
- 2 Śālākyaatantra (Minor Surgery)
- 3 Kīyācikitsā (Medicine)
- 4 Bhūtavidyā (Demonology)
- 5 Kāumārabhyāsa (the Science of Paediatrics)
- 6 Agadatantra (Toxicology)
- 7 Rasāyana (the Science that treats of prolonging life)
- 8 Vājīkaranatantra (the Science of Aphrodisiacs)

And these precisely correspond to the division of this Science in its rudimentary stage as we have deduced above from the hymns of the Atharva Veda

2. An account of the achievements of the oldest Hindus in the Science and in other aspects is given in my book *Some Aspects of Indian Civilisation*. Calcutta 1919.

